DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 221 UD 030 123

TITLE	Joint Field Hearing on H.R. 6: Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization. Joint Hearing before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. House of Representatives, One Hundred Third Congress, First Session (Providence, Rhode Island, October 4, 1993).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, DC. House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education.; Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and Humanities.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-16-044776-3
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	86p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Attitudes; *Educational Legislation; Elementary School Teachers; *Elementary Secondary Education; Hearings; *Professional Development; Public Schools; Secondary School Teachers; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 103rd; *Elementary Secondary Education Act; Reauthorization Legislation

ABSTRACT

This document presents, as part of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, witness testimony and prepared statements on the subject of professional development in the elementary and secondary school systems. Witnesses included Rhode Island (RI) elementary and secondary school principals and teachers, officials from the RI Department of Education, U.S. congressional members, and commissioners and superintendents of schools. Among the attendees were Daniel F. Casey, Superintendent of Schools for the Catholic Diocese of RI; elementary school principal Robert J. Britto; Edward Eddy, Chairman, Providence Blueprint for Education; Peter McWalters, Commissioner, RI, Department of Education; and Arthur Zarrella, Superintendent, Providence Public Schools. Prepared statements are also included from RI's U.S. Senator Claiborne Pell and Congressman Jack Reed. (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

JOINT FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

ED 375 221

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AND THE

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES

OF THE

SENATE COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN PROVIDENCE, RI, OCTOBER 4, 1993

Committee on Education and Labor Serial No. 103-71
Committee on Labor and Human Resources Serial No. 103-641

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 0301 55

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
81-246 CC WASHINGTON : 1994

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-044776-3

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA, American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware

PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO, Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island
HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, Minnesota

NICK LITTLEFIELD, *Staff Director and Chief Counsel*
SUSAN K. HATTAN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS AND HUMANITIES

CLAIBORNE PELL, Rhode Island, *Chairman*

HOWARD M. METZENBAUM, Ohio
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
PAUL SIMON, Illinois
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts
PAUL D. WELLSTONE, Minnesota
HARRIS WOFFORD, Pennsylvania
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
NANCY LANDON KASSEBAUM, Kansas
DAN COATS, Indiana
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
STROM THURMOND, South Carolina
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
DAVE DURENBERGER, New Mexico

DAVID V. EVANS, *Staff Director*
PAM DEVITT, *Minority Professional Staff*

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Providence, RI, October 4, 1993	1
Statement of:	
Britto, Robert J., Principal, Edmund W. Flynn Model Elementary School, Providence, RI	1
Casey, Daniel F., Superintendent of Schools for the Catholic Diocese of Rhode Island, Providence, RI; Colleen Bielecki, Sixth Grade Teacher and Professional Development Consultant, Northern Lincoln Elementary, Lincoln, RI; Shirley Cherry, Librarian, Portsmouth High School, Portsmouth, RI; Dorla Long, Fourth Grade Teacher, Matunuck Elementary School, South Kingstown, RI; and Andrea Mattia, Fifth Grade Teacher, Head Teacher, Edmund W. Flynn School, Providence, RI	40
Eddy, Edward, Chairman, Providence Blueprint for Education, Providence, RI; and Theodore Sizer, Chairman, Coalition of Essential Schools, Providence, RI	27
McWalters, Hon. Peter, Commissioner, Rhode Island Department of Education, Providence, RI; and Hon. Americo Petrocelli, Commissioner, Office of Higher Education, Providence, RI	14
Zarrella, Arthur, Superintendent, Providence Public Schools, Providence, RI	4
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Bielecki, Colleen, Sixth Grade Teacher and Professional Development Consultant, Northern Lincoln Elementary, Lincoln, RI, prepared statement of	51
Britto, Robert J., Principal, Edmund W. Flynn Model Elementary School, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	3
Casey, Daniel F., Superintendent of Schools for the Catholic Diocese of Rhode Island, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	43
Cherry, Shirley, Librarian, Portsmouth High School, Portsmouth, RI, prepared statement of	59
Eddy, Edward, Chairman, Providence Blueprint for Education, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	30
Long, Dorla, Fourth Grade Teacher, Matunuck Elementary School, South Kingstown, RI, prepared statement of	65
Mattia, Andrea, Fifth Grade Teacher, Head Teacher, Edmund W. Flynn School, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	72
Ochoa, Carley, Riverside Unified School District, Southern California, prepared statement of	78
Pell, Hon. Claiborne, a Senator in Congress from the State of Rhode Island, prepared statement of	7
Petrocelli, Hon. Americo, Commissioner, Office of Higher Education, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	19
Reed, Hon. Jack, a Representative in Congress from the State of Rhode Island, prepared statement of	12
Sizer, Theodore, Chairman, Coalition of Essential Schools, Providence, RI, prepared statement of	34

JOINT FIELD HEARING ON H.R. 6: ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

MONDAY, OCTOBER 4, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, AND U.S. SENATE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, ARTS, AND HUMANITIES, COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND HUMAN RESOURCES,
Providence, RI.

The subcommittees met, pursuant to notice, at 9:45 a.m., at the Edmund W. Flynn Model Elementary School, 220 Blackstone Street, Providence, Rhode Island, Hon. Claiborne Pell [Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and Humanities] and Hon. Jack Reed, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Reed and Unsoeld and Senator Pell.

Staff present: Margaret Smith, staff assistant; Michael Dannenberg, professional staff member; David Evans, staff director; Agnieszka Fryszman, legislative director; Nancy Langrall, policy coordinator.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. BRITTO, PRINCIPAL, EDMUND W. FLYNN MODEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Mr. BRITTO. Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, Congresswoman Unsoeld, distinguished guests and speakers, I am Robert J. Britto, Principal of the Edmund W. Flynn Model Elementary School.

It is a great honor and pleasure for me to welcome you here today on behalf of the Flynn faculty, staff, students, and parents.

Your decision to conduct this hearing at an urban school site provides clear evidence of your concrete commitment to support the daily efforts of all of us whose professional lives are no less intensely committed to public school improvement.

I am particularly pleased that the comprehensive topic of this congressional hearing recognizes as a major goal of school reform the need for professional development of teachers.

We invite you to tour the school at the conclusion of these proceedings, and we extend to you an open invitation to return to Flynn School at any time to visit classrooms as guest speakers or readers.

I thank the committee for the opportunity to express my thoughts on the issue of professional development.

The education profession has been quick to pose myriad questions on the goals and logistics of school improvement, and certainly we have been eager to offer a host of responses to these inquiries.

When sifted through and sorted out, the most fundamental of these questions stubbornly remain: How well do our schools reflect our best ideas on cognitive development? How do we restructure—and what?—to realize our best ideas on teaching and learning?

Any discussion intending to bring about reforms that enjoy some measure of community support, on the one hand, and on the other, meet certain accrediting standards must first recognize the need for professional development.

Of course, professional development is not a new concept. School departments and State education agencies do provide in-service opportunities, but all too often these efforts are episodic or disjointed from contemporary research-based discoveries.

What is truly needed are continuous investments of time and funding for faculty and administration that draw from the critical theories and practices in the cognitive sciences and related work in designing alternative/authentic assessments.

Moreover, the practitioners must learn to engage effectively in team building strategies.

As a Nation, we already are confronting the challenge to fund genuine school improvement initiatives at realistic levels.

We are already shepherding these investments to programs and facilitators that support and advocate an epistemology that addresses our community, regional, and global needs for the 21st century.

To appropriate funds at any level for merely more of the historically bankrupt same is already proving futile and frustrating.

Professional development programs must empower teachers and administrators with the requisite knowledge and skills to systematically abandon the archaic factory model of school in favor of the model of school as a multicultural and multiracial community of learners, a community wherein all ages continue to learn.

No one has thought that this task not be an easy one.

Although the theories of contemporary cognitive scientists solidly discredit tiresomely out-of-place beliefs and practices concerning intellect, knowledge, and instruction, the allure of these comfortable, familiar habits remains tenacious, understandable if irrational, and a formidable obstacle to reform.

The educational reform initiatives of the past years have engendered an array of disparate programs and practices.

The oppositional ethos of these many endeavors mitigates against the practitioners' easy acceptance of externally imposed approaches to school improvement.

To internalize the need for change, teachers and administrators must first understand the most relevant theories and practices of cognitive development, what is happening in the research and on the field.

This understanding provides the point of departure for a grand but promisingly productive dialogue among professionals, a dialogue that in the face of research-based discoveries boldly questions current notions of curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

Frank and imaginative responses to the stark questions about just what makes real-world solutions is the only critical framework for today's debate and any hope for substantive change.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Britto follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT J. BRITTO, PRINCIPAL, E.W. FLYNN MODEL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

The education profession has been quick to pose myriad questions on the goals and logistics of school improvement and certainly we have been eager to offer a host of responses to these inquiries. When sifted through and sorted out, the most fundamental of these questions stubbornly remain: How well do our schools reflect our best ideas on cognitive development? How do we restructure—and what?—to realize our best ideas on teaching and learning (Elmore).

Any discussion intending to bring about reforms that enjoy some measure of community support, on the one hand, and on the other, meet certain accrediting standards must first recognize the need for professional development. Of course, professional development is not a new concept. School departments and State education agencies do provide in-service opportunities, but all too often these efforts are episodic or disjointed from contemporary research-based discoveries. What is truly needed are continuous investments of time and funding for faculty and administration that draw from the critical theories and practices in the cognitive sciences and related work in designing alternative/authentic assessments (cf. Gardner on theory of multiple intelligences; and Wolf, Bixby, Glenn, and Gardner on epistemology of the mind). Moreover, the practitioners must learn to engage effectively in team building strategies.

As a Nation, we already are confronting the challenge to fund genuine school improvement initiatives at realistic levels. We are already shepherding these investments to programs and facilitators that support and advocate an epistemology that addresses our community, regional, and global needs for the 21st century. To appropriate funds at any level for merely more of the historically bankrupt same is already proving futile and frustrating. Professional development programs must empower teachers and administrators with the requisite knowledge and skills to systematically abandon the archaic factory model of school in favor of the model of school as a multicultural and multiracial community of learners—a community wherein all ages continue to learn. No one has thought that this task not be an easy one. Although the theories of contemporary cognitive scientists solidly discredit tiresomely out-of-place beliefs and practices concerning intellect, knowledge, and instruction, the allure of these comfortable, familiar habits remains tenacious, understandable, if irrational, and a formidable obstacle to reform.

The educational reform initiatives of the past years have engendered an array of disparate programs and practices. The oppositional ethos of these many endeavors mitigates against the practitioners' easy acceptance of externally imposed approaches to school improvement. To internalize the need for change, teachers and administrators must first understand the most relevant theories and practices of cognitive development, what is happening in the research and on the field. This understanding provides the point of departure for a grand but promisingly productive dialogue among professionals—a dialogue that in the face of research-based discoveries boldly questions current notions of curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Frank and imaginative responses to the stark questions about just what makes real-world solutions is the only critical framework for today's debate and any hope for substantive change.

Bibliography

Elmore, Richard F. "Teaching, Learning, and Organization: School Restructuring and the Recurring Dilemmas of Reform," from a revised version of an invited address at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association at Chicago, Illinois in April, 1991.

Gardner, Howard. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 1983).

Wolf, Dennie P.; Bixby, Janet; Glenn III, John; Gardner, Howard. "To Use Their Minds Well: Investigating New Forms of Student Assessment." *Review of Research in Education*, Vol. 17. American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC, 1991; pp. 31–74.

Mr. BRITTO. At this time, I invite Dr. Arthur Zarrella, Superintendent of Providence Public Schools, to deliver his greetings.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR ZARRELLA, SUPERINTENDENT, PROVIDENCE PUBLIC SCHOOLS, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Dr. ZARRELLA. Thank you, Robert, and thank you for that eloquent statement on behalf of Providence and all of our schoolchildren.

Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, Congresswoman Unsoeld, it certainly is my pleasure this morning, on behalf of over 23,000 students in the Providence School Department and over 2,000 employees, as well as my colleagues in the field of education, to welcome you to Providence this morning, to welcome you to the Providence School Department, and to welcome you to Flynn Elementary School.

I would be certainly remiss this morning if I didn't extend to Senator Pell and to Congressman Reed the thanks of the Providence School Department for your untiring efforts in assisting with—in assisting us, the Providence School Department, in obtaining the magnet school grant which was recently announced.

That close to $3 million which we will be getting over two years will certainly go a long way toward assisting us to implement our choice plan in Providence where parents will have a greater say in the schools that their children will attend and also helping us to eliminate minority group isolation.

I welcome you this morning to a system where education reform is alive and well. I welcome you to a system that is including all elements of the school community in its planning efforts for school reform.

I welcome you this morning to a system where schools and the personnel in those schools and the communities that surround those schools are taking the responsibility for school reform, but probably more importantly, accepting the responsibility to be accountable for what happens in those schools.

I welcome you this morning to a school that does—to a school system that does have a plan for school improvement, the much talked about PROBE study. However, I would also welcome you to an urban system that cannot afford further reductions in primary funding sources such as Title I.

I welcome you to Providence at a time when you have the opportunity, at a critical point in this country's history, to create a level playing field so that all children will have the opportunity to receive an excellent education.

The passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in a form to address the needs of underprivileged youth is a necessity if we are not to create a two-tiered society, one for the educated and privileged and one for the poor and those children who do not have an education.

In your deliberations today and in your further deliberations regarding this Act, remember that the American dream is at risk for thousands of poor and unprivileged children if we do not provide them with a quality education.

I welcome you today to Providence with the hope that you will receive and hear the testimony today that would certainly help you in your deliberations so that this Act will truly benefit the children for which it is intended, and on behalf of all of my colleagues who serve in various capacities in the education field, who remember that, first of all, we are all teachers, I would like to remind you of the words of Christa McAuliffe, who said, "I touch the future. I teach."

Welcome to Providence. I hope your day is certainly a productive one.

Senator PELL. The joint hearing of the House and the Senate education subcommittees will be in order. This is one of the Senate's initial reauthorization hearings. It is also one of the final hearings in the House.

In the Senate, we will focus on the initiative of the administration from the very beginning. In the House, the administration proposal is the culmination of this hearing process.

I would observe here that, on the Senate side, Senator Chafee was here with us but had to be at a funeral, and Bob Mirelli had asked me to present his apologies and acknowledge his presence.

I think, in this whole hearing and during our work, we should bear in mind the National Education Goals, because that's the backdrop, the background for what we will discuss this morning, and those goals are six:

First, all children in America will start school ready to learn.

Second, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.

Third, American students will leave grades four, eight, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, math, science, history, and geography.

Fourth, U.S. students will be the first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.

Fifth, every adult American will be literate and possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in the global economy.

Sixth, every school in American will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

These are the six goals, the six principles that should guide us this morning and in all our work as to what type of educational system we hope to see.

President Clinton has been in office less than nine months. Yet, in that short timespan, the Department of Education, under the leadership of Secretary Riley, has been doing a fine job.

The product of their labors the Improving America's School Act of 1993, a comprehensive, thoughtful initiative of which I and many others are proud to be cosponsors.

The administration's bill is landmark legislation. Its purpose is to spur and augment the education reform movement already underway throughout our Nation.

I would express my gratitude and say the Department is represented here by Thomas Wolanin, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, and I thank him very much for being with us this morning.

While I wish that our resources were unlimited and we could double our education spending, harsh realities are just the opposite.

We must bear in mind that, while the Federal education grant is only about 6 percent of the total money spent on education, the Chapter 1 program, which we are focusing on today, constitutes two-thirds of all the money spent on compensatory education—Federal, State, and local.

It is not just another education program. It is the critical education program in elementary and secondary education at the Federal level.

Seriously underfunded, today only about half of all the eligible children are actually served under the Chapter 1 program.

If we are to be a world leader, we must have a world-class educational system. That means tough, challenging standards for all students.

We cannot turn attention away either from the problem of dropouts. Each year, one-half million, 500,000 students drop out of school. Through the demonstration program., we have identified new innovative ways to address this problem.

This reauthorization is a massive undertaking, critically important.

In 1950, there were 17 Americans working for every one who was retired. Today, there are only three working for every one who is retired, and one of those three is a minority.

The correlation between minority status and poverty is a disheartening reality, a disheartening fact of life. Yet, it is a reality we can and must address if through a world-class education, America is to have the world-class workforce it needs to remain a world leader.

The administration has offered a bold, imaginative reauthorization initiative. To my mind, it is something we can build upon and enact.

Congressman Reed and I are cochairing this hearing. So, I now would turn to Congressman Reed.

TYPE OF DEGREE	AVERAGE MONTHLY EARNINGS
Professional	$4,961
Doctorate	$3,855
Master's	$2,822
Bachelor's	$2,116
Associate's	$1,672
Vocational	$1,237
Some college, no degree	$1,280
High school	$1,077
Not a high school graduate	$492

[The prepared statement of Senator Pell follows:]

Statement of Senator Claiborne Pell (D,RI)
Rhode Island Field Hearing
Reauthorization of The Elementary & Secondary Education Act
Flynn School, Providence, RI, October 4, 1993

This joint hearing of the House and Senate Education Subcommittees will come to order. While this is one of the Senate's initial reauthorization hearings, it is one of the final hearings in the House. In the Senate, we will focus on the Administration's initiative from the beginning. In the House, the Administration's proposal is the culmination of their hearing process.

To Rhode Island and the nation, this legislation is extremely important. Annually, Rhode Island receives almost $30 million dollars through federal elementary and secondary education programs. These range from the critically important Chapter 1 program, which provides Rhode Island more than $20 million dollars a year, to a series of smaller, but equally critical programs.

President Clinton has been in office less than nine months. Yet, in that short time span, the Department of Education, under the very able leadership of Secretary Richard Riley, has been hard at work. The product of their labors is The Improving America's Schools Act of 1993, a very comprehensive and thoughtful legislative initiative of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

The Administration's bill is truly landmark legislation. Its purpose is to spur and augment the education reform movement already underway throughout our nation. Its intent is to insure that an education of excellence and opportunity reaches into every classroom in America, particularly those most in need of our help.

The Department is represented here today by Dr. Thomas Wolanin, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs. He is a friend and colleague who previously directed the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee under Congressman Bill Ford. We have a good working relationship, and we welcome him here today.

As I mentioned earlier, the Chapter 1 program is our major federal elementary and secondary education initiative. While the federal contribution to general education is only about 6%, the Chapter 1 program constitutes two-thirds

of all the money -- federal, state, and local -- that is spent on basic skills instruction for children from less well off families in our nation. It isn't just another education program. It is the critical education program in elementary and secondary education at the federal level. It is seriously underfunded, and today only about half of all eligible children are actually served under the Chapter 1 program.

While I wish that our resources were unlimited and that we could double federal education spending, I am afraid the harsh reality is quite the opposite. We are confronted with severe fiscal restraints, and the unpleasant truth is that funding will not reach the levels I am sure we all believe are necessary.

In that regard, it is crucial, perhaps now more than ever before, that federal legislation be carefully crafted and better targeted so that programs will reach children who have the greatest need and the least resources to meet those needs.

If America is to remain a world leader, we must have a world-class education system. This means tough, challenging standards for all students, and education programs that live up to those standards. The Administration's legislative proposals clearly recognize that principle as they seek to push a comprehensive reform of education that focuses not only upon the whole child but also the whole school.

Most important, the legislation remains true to the original purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. That legislation recognized that there were areas in our nation where poverty robbed our children of educational opportunity and advancement. Almost thirty years after the enactment of that legislation, this situation unfortunately remains all too prevalent in community after community across our land. To those communities, schools and children, federal aid is not just helpful, but absolutely necessary. We cannot relax our commitment to those children. In fact, it must be intensified.

Also, as we proceed with reauthorization, we cannot lose sight of the fact that full participation in our society. . . . .in the workplace and at home. . . depends upon the ability to read, write, and compute. Thus, as we look at the

whole education of the child, we simply cannot neglect the basics. This is something I consider of paramount importance as we move this legislation forward.

On many occasions I have said that the teacher is the linchpin to a quality education. I adhere to that belief even more strongly today. Little can be accomplished without a good teacher. The Eisenhower Math and Science program, which I authored as part of the Education for Economic Security Act, has been a resounding success. It is time, however, to build upon those accomplishments and to extend them to other areas, such as English, history, civics and government, and the arts. I strongly support the Administration's efforts in this area.

There are other areas where we must act as well. Reauthorization and strengthening of proven programs such as drug free schools, innovation in education, magnet schools, gifted and talented education, and civics and government instruction is critical. The reasons for programs such as these is clear. The school must be a safe place where learning dominates. Innovative education approaches must extend to our most troubled areas so that education is, in fact, the way out of isolation and poverty in our society. The gifted must be pushed to excel to the limits of their ability, and not held back because of a lack of challenging programs. And, for every child there must be better development of critical thinking skills about the underpinnings of our democracy, and a much greater exposure to the arts and humanities that define a civilized society.

We cannot turn attention away from the problem of dropouts. Each and every year, over one-half million students drop out of school. Through the Dropout Demonstration program, we have identified new and innovative ways to address this serious problem. We must build upon what we have learned.

This reauthorization is a massive undertaking. It is critically important. In 1950 there were 17 Americans working for every one who was retired. Today, there are only 3 working for every one who is retired, and one of those three is a minority. Unfortunately, the correlation between minority status and poverty is a disheartening reality. Yet, it is a reality we can and must address if through a

world-class education America is to have the world-class workforce it needs to remain a world leader. The Clinton Administration has offered a bold and imaginative reauthorization initiative. To my mind, it is something we should build upon and enact.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Senator Pell. I am honored to join you today, with the House subcommittee on education, to conduct a hearing on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is a delight to be with you, as it always is, and to recognize your leadership over many years and particularly vital leadership as we look at this reauthorization.

I would like to also acknowledge Senator Chafee, who could not stay with us but I know wanted to be here to participate, and it is particularly delightful to welcome to Rhode Island my colleague, Jolene Unsoeld, from Washington State.

I flew out there—what, two years ago?

Ms. UNSOELD. Two years ago.

Mr. REED. [continuing] for a field hearing. It is a six-hour flight to Washington, and only an hour flight to Providence, so we will have you back again to even the score.

I also want to thank many people who helped this hearing take place: the Principal, Bob Britto, of the Flynn School, not only for his words but for all the work he has done, along with his staff and his teachers, to host this hearing so graciously; the Providence School Department, for their assistance in setting up this hearing; Dimension Cable, which is taping this hearing for a later broadcast over the Cable Interconnect so that a broader range of Rhode Islanders can see this hearing and participate and understand, we hope, better the professional development issues we will discuss today.

Also, I want to thank the staff, who did more than anyone to make sure that this hearing was successful: my staff, Agnieszka Fryszman; David Evans on the Senator's staff; and all the staff members who worked so hard, and particularly, from the Department of Education, Tom Wolanin—Tom is here.

Tom was a staff member of the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education, and so, we can decide, based on our relative performances, whether he trained me or I trained him. I think it is probably the fact he trained me.

Professional development is the critical topic we are going to address today.

In education, we have a triad—children, teachers, and parents. Of that triad, I think the place where we can apply the most leverage, the place where we can multiply our resources most dramatically is in the professional development of teachers, and that is something we have to do.

Ideally, we could use this reauthorization to make teachers in the classroom, together with principals acting as educational leaders, the fulcrum of educational reform in the United States, and I hope we do that.

The President and Secretary Riley have developed a very ambitious and very, I think, well-written, well-researched proposal for reauthorization.

We are going to take it up in the House and the Senate and try to use these hearings to make it even a better proposal, more in keeping with the demands that we face in education.

There are two thoughts that I would like to just briefly emphasize with respect to the professional development aspects.

I think we really have to have a strong link between elementary and secondary education and higher education when it comes to professional development, and second, I think we have to ensure that this process of professional development reaches the cutting edge, which is the classroom, that it is not short-circuited elsewhere, that we do not invest in lots of elaborate overhead but that we actually reach out into the classroom and allow teachers to improve their skills as they teach the next generation of Americans.

Someone wrote a book a few years ago saying, "Everything I learned I learned in kindergarten." Obviously, I was not paying attention early in my life, because it took me a few more years to learn everything I know.

I learned a lot in the service, and one thing I learned was a famous saying by General Clark that says a unit does best what a commander checks, and one thing that I think we have been missing in the professional development is that kind of critical, non-destructive evaluation of teachers in the classroom by other experienced and senior teachers, and I would hope some way in our deliberations we could build that back into the system.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Jack Reed follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

I would like to welcome everyone here today to this joint hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities and the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education. I am honored to once again be able to cochair a hearing with my distinguished senior senator, Senator Claiborne Pell.

I would also like to welcome Congresswoman Jolene Unsoeld of Washington State, a distinguished colleague of mine from the House Education and Labor Committee who has come all the way from the West Coast to be with us today for this important hearing.

I want to thank everyone at Flynn School and, especially Principal Bob Britto, for their gracious hospitality in hosting this field hearing. I enjoyed reading your school highlights bulletin from last year—and was very impressed: students at Flynn last year worked to preserve the rain forest, participated in the Providence Journal Stock Market Game, designed original games about Dinosaurs, and won awards in an international arts competition. And the staff has worked hard to build links with the community, to benefit from the resources available at our institutions of higher education, and to keep pace with new techniques. It is clear you do a lot to ensure your students learn well and I was pleased that your motto is "All children can learn," because this must be the theme of our reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We cannot afford to leave any children behind.

We have all heard a lot about the problems of our educational system. At the heart of the solution, I believe, is professional development. Everyone agrees we need high standards for all children, but to translate those standards into better outcomes for our students we need to address what is happening within the classroom. I remember, not so long ago, schools would send senior teachers into classrooms to evaluate, and help, other teachers. That practice now seems to be a thing of the past. Today, teachers are sent out alone to deal with the increasing challenges faced by our schools, including the breakdown of the family, urban violence, and the demand for an increasingly sophisticated workforce. Like other professionals, school-based educators need continuous learning opportunities to take advantage of new technologies, and to keep pace with a changing society.

I am pleased that the Clinton reform proposal places a strong emphasis on professional development. One of the most effective steps we can take in reforming American education is to provide resources and enhance the expertise of our educators, as well as to ensure that young people are ready to learn when they come to school, and that parents are full participants in their children's education.

Finally, I want to thank the witnesses for taking the time to come here today and share their expertise with us as we reexamine the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We need to know what works and what doesn't so we can do more for

our kids. Our kids are our best resource. If we shortchange their education, we shortchange our own future.

Mr. REED. Now, I have a great deal of pleasure and pride to introduce my colleague from Washington State, Jolene Unsoeld. She is a woman of charm and dignity, intellect and integrity. All of that sometimes masks a very passionate advocacy for the issues.

She is a fighter for children on the Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee. She is a passionate environmentalist, and I serve also on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with her.

She is someone who has spent her life trying to make this dream of America, opportunity for all, a reality, and I am delighted and honored to have her here.

Jolene, thank you.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you. It is good to be here.

It was two years ago, when we were doing the higher education reauthorization, that you came to my State, and I am delighted that, as we take up the President's proposal on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to be able to come here, because it is—you are very good at describing the good things that are happening here, but it is of special importance to be able to come and to see in person and to be able to hear in person and feel what you—your ideas and to hear your solutions and recommendations to the Congress as we take this up.

I believe the teachers very, very much need our support. They have probably one of the most difficult and most important roles in our society, and I am delighted that, in the administration's proposal, there is such an emphasis on the training and the assistance to help those teachers become better. We need to be able to provide them with support, because increasingly they are taking up a role in sometimes dysfunctional families.

I do not know what to do about this mike. I will bet it was not turned on. It was not turned on. Now is that better? I will repeat a little bit of what I said.

What a delight it is to be able to come and to feel in person and to see what you are doing and to hear your ideas from you. As good an interpreter as my—as Jack is, there is a special importance to be able to come in person.

As teachers are asked to take up more and more of the crucial role in our society for what I consider to be the most important thing to our Nation's national security, the education of our young, it is particularly gratifying that the President's proposal on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has such a strong component for teacher training and development and staff training and development.

I think that will be crucial as we try to support teachers in this very crucial role that they are playing, and I thank you very much, Jack, for letting me come and participate in your hearing.

Senator PELL. We now come to the witnesses, and the first panel is the Honorable Peter McWalters for higher education and the Honorable Americo Petrocelli for general education. I misspoke. Reverse that. I think that Mr. Peter McWalters will lead off, and he represents general education.

STATEMENTS OF HON. PETER McWALTERS, COMMISSIONER, RHODE ISLAND DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND; AND HON. AMERICO PETROCELLI, COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Mr. McWALTERS. Thank you very much. Thank you for coming, Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, and Congresswoman Unsoeld. Thank you very much.

Reiterating a little bit of what you have already been told, we are most particularly pleased that you chose to come and that you came to an urban school.

You are in a school that is struggling in very good faith with many of the issues that are raised in this bill, and I hope you take the offer to visit after the presentations.

I want to get right to the heart of something that is very—that I feel very strongly about, and that is that I want it unmistakably clear that I support the intentions as they are outlined in this bill, but the one—there is a couple of words in here that I take very seriously—and I have been passing out my little buttons—and it is the all-kids issue, and I do not want to make light of that, because it is too easy to say all children can learn, all children will learn, but the truth is we represent an industry that has never believed that and never been set up to do that, and I have to go on record with that constantly to remind people of that.

Ever since—for the last 10 years, we have been kind of beating ourselves up about the condition of American public education, and every once in a while it takes a second to step back and remind ourselves that, in terms of what we were asked to do, we have very much to be proud of.

We had Ernest Boyer here just a few weeks ago, and as you know, he is an eloquent spokesman for both children and education, and he reminds us to look back at the history of this effort, and Rhode Island and Providence, just like many other places in this country, can proudly stand here today and say that, given what we have been asked to do, we are doing better than we have ever done.

There are more graduates, not fewer, more students graduating with higher skills, not lower, more attainment. So, we have much to be proud of. That is not actually the problem.

The problem is not that we are doing better in the old world. It has something to do with maybe we are obsolete. We are not broken. Broken implies that, at once, you were not broken. We are doing very, very well at what we used to do.

The trouble is that someplace in the last 15 or 20 years, the economic infrastructure of this country changed radically, and as now we are being asked to "retool" to service this new requirement, I do not think there is a great understanding of what that is going to take.

As I read this reauthorization bill, I was very impressed. The authors are precise and careful.

The first and most important issue is the public policy issue of all children, all children regardless of where they are coming from, breaking through the predictability of social class, taking on the

issue of special needs and second language, all children, not negotiable.

The second issue is standards, outcomes, student performance, for the first time, as asked for in here and asked for at the State level, to be explicit in what we expect of our children.

As you know, as we know in Rhode Island, performance is easily associated, if you look at the demographics, with where your parents can afford to buy their house.

We do not have explicit standards, we have units, and as you leave the system and you are finally measured, tragically your performance is predictable by wealth and family background, particularly the mother's education.

This suggests that we, for the first time in public policy, are going to attempt to be explicit about what we want all children to know and be able to do.

If we do not have that fundamental belief in all of our children and if we do not—if we are not explicit about what we want them to know and be able to do, then I suppose any route will get us there.

Now, the mechanics of actually getting us there, I think, are also well outlined in here. We are going to have to decentralize and get the decisions made closest to the learner, but I like the cautions in here.

We already have enough evidence that suggests decentralization alone, without the goals, without the statements about accountability, will just as quickly reinvent yesterday as anything else. There is no magic bullet in decentralization.

There are words in here concerning compacts and contracts, the issue, then, of not only decentralizing but understanding what retooling means, and that is the center of what today's discussion is.

Staff development or what I would like to think of as professional development, as outlined here and as supported at least by me, requires that we first understand that we are asking people to try to rethink the whole industry.

That means we need readiness, it means we need the kind of training that is provided in the private sector when they are going to go off-line and rethink the industry. That is a substantial investment, and it is more than just the techniques of teaching. It is the readiness to even deal with change, to manage change.

The second is the issue of knowledge base, and I think that is where the link between the higher education piece and this general education is most profound.

The whole rethinking of where we recruit teachers from, the kinds of programs we put them through to get them initially certified, the experience of tenure, and the rethinking of lifelong continuous learning and recertification are all a very powerful leverage to bringing about the kinds of knowledge base, readiness, intervention, responsibility, professional ethics that I think are going to be necessary in order to pull off the retooling exercise, but there are other components in here I must mention, because they are important to me.

One is the fact that there are some, I think, eloquent statements about parents and the changing role of parents and the fact that, in this document, parents are also recognized to need access to the

policy table, they need access and compacts and contracts with teachers around what is going to happen with their children and who holds what responsibility to do what to make sure we get there, eloquently stated, this issue of a relationship with teachers and the issue of joint responsibility, shared responsibility, and finally, a whole discussion about the fact that that also needs a support system.

Parents need access to the kinds of same training and information systems that the rest of the industry is going to have to have if this is going to work.

Finally, there is the reference in here to what we think, in Rhode Island, of as the wraparound services question.

This has to be thought of as raising our children, and we are only going to raise our children when we provide support systems to families. So, the issue of schools as community centers and all the attendant interactions are also part of this.

To back off and summarize for the purposes of discussion, all children, public policy, explicitly stated, with full knowledge, Senator, as you said, that in this country, all children raises fundamental questions about class and race, all children against high standards, explicitly stated and publicly reported.

Of all the instruments in order to pull that off, there is the one essential one, and it is not even the decentralization one, it is the professional development one, because if I have a vision of a future, it is teachers who have come through a rethought system of where they come from and how they are trained, how they are certified and how they are supported.

They are powerful, they authorize, they have capacity, they have knowledge, they are collegial, and they are driven by a profound ethic that says all children, this child, can learn, and I will do whatever has to be done in order to make that happen.

That very image is counter to the very nature of bureaucracy, and it is counter to the nature of the industry we have put together, which is essentially a controlling and mistrusting environment if you are a teacher. In order to pull that off, we have to retool, and we need the respect and the resources to do it.

I was pleased to see in here the research base that suggested there is evidence that, in effective institutions, we have to start thinking in terms of 30 days of access to professionals if we really want to do what we need to do to get it done, and then set up the contract so that they feel accountable and authorized to do it.

All kids, standards, professional development.

Thank you.

Senator PELL. We now turn to the Honorable Americo Petrocelli and look forward to hearing from him.

Mr. PETROCELLI. Thank you, Senator Pell, Representative Reed, and Representative Unsoeld, distinguished guests. It is really a pleasure for me to be here.

In inviting the Commissioner of Higher Education, representing higher education, I believe that you have underscored much of what Peter has just said, but you have underscored what should be one of the major features of all Federal legislation in the area of education and which is a feature of the Clinton administration proposal, "Improving America's Schools," and that is that higher

education has an important role to play in helping to make schools a better place in which to teach and to learn.

Increasingly, the boundaries between elementary and secondary education have become less pronounced and the wisdom of working across those boundaries more apparent. In Rhode Island, we have several examples of such partnerships.

As you are aware, the Children's Crusade for Higher Education was initiated by higher education in this State to encourage all children, especially those from low-income families, to stay in school and to make the transition into postsecondary education.

The motivation there really was for higher education to play two important roles, and one was to find a role to motivate poor children to stay in school so that we in higher education will have an opportunity to deal with them when they finished, and the second major operation is in the professional development phase that so many of you have spoken about.

The 2+2 Tech program at the Community College is another effort at the partnership and a successful one, and the Rhode Island Skills Commission is developing alternative routes to help students move from basic education into programs that will help them train.

As Commissioner of Higher Education, I see a necessity for these programs to be very holistic, that the interest that we should have in young students from a higher education perspective not be merely to get them into our halls or into our seats, and thus, the crusade, for example, enters into a signed contract with the student and the parent, and the push there is higher education, trade schools, proprietary schools, really working off the edict of—or the experience that we have learned over all of these years.

In 1932, Henry Ford made his famous statement during the—that depression, and that is if—he said, if you give me a man—and they were primarily men in the workforce—who is on unemployment, I will give you a production worker in 24 hours.

In 1993, the statement is, if you give me one ill prepared, I will give you a productive citizen of this country in 14 years.

So, we must insist that all children be educated, and that is new, and I agree with Peter, that is new. It is the first time in the history of America where we must be concerned about the education of poor children.

We have never had that need before. We have never operated off that need before. We designed a system that did not deal with that need before, and this Act intelligently, in many of its aspects, speaks to those areas.

Matter of fact, from the very onset, some 30 years ago, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, starting as it did, as part of President Johnson's war on poverty—very interesting—identified education as a poverty prevention tool, because education offers the one real hope for low-income children to move to greater affluence.

I suggest that there be a sense of urgency, 30 years later, and not from the same perspective. Thirty years ago, the focus was on doing something good about people in poverty and helping them. The urgency today is to help America.

Without them educated in this society, then this society has very little chance of remaining competitive—or forget that word—in my estimation, of succeeding in any way, shape, or form.

You cannot—you are in a city in which 63, 65 percent of the youngsters this afternoon will get free or reduced lunch. They are in poverty. We cannot allow them to then represent an adult population that is 63 percent in poverty.

What is to intercede? Keeping them in school, keeping them educated, and society as a whole learning how to adopt all of them as their children given the number of broken and difficult family situations in which many youngsters find themselves today, and I am pleased that this Act addresses those points: motivate the child, not bricks and mortar. It is motivate the child, supply in their lives the encouragement which is so difficult for them to get, and to do that with well-trained teachers.

If all of this is to work, poor children must be held to the same academic standards and be provided the same excellent teachers and facilities as their more privileged counterparts.

Higher education has the role in this process by ensuring that those college students preparing themselves for careers in teaching have the capabilities and are provided the programs that will make them superb teachers.

Higher education also has a responsibility to help practicing teachers hone their skills and to become educational managers who can provide their students with experience and content that engage their attention and challenge their minds. I do not think we have done well enough in that. I do not think we have done nearly well enough.

Consequently, Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most important part of the legislation to higher education, because it provides funding and encouragement for professional development activities.

For goodness sakes, we have run one experiment after another. Rarely have these experiments in the field of education been proved completely wanting, but we have never taken the experiment and moved to the production room, and as we find things that work, please, can we now make them universal?

That was the intent of going after every third-grader in every school, private, public, anywhere, based on programs that had 25 years of solid research behind them that said they work.

Let us quit patting ourselves on the back over a successful experiment until that experiment is translated into mass production, into something that affects the lives of everyone involved.

As I noted, consequently, Title II is important. Rhode Island has a good track record of using Eisenhower funds. When I say that, I mean we have as good a track record as anybody in running experiments. We want to make a fundamental change as a result of those experiments, and I think this Act moves us in that direction.

We would welcome the opportunity, however, to expand those activities to include other content areas referenced in the National Education Goals. That will take money. As you know, the Eisenhowers have concentrated on mathematics and science.

Our faculty members in education and arts and science have much to offer to the school reform movement and much to learn from this movement.

Keeping higher education institutions and State offices of higher education as active partners in Title II is essential to promoting these relationships.

The funding of Title II is also crucial and must be increased if new partnerships are to be developed beyond those in the areas of mathematical—mathematics and science.

Overall, the direction proposed for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is appropriate, in my judgment, and in keeping with much of the philosophy and many of the efforts here in Rhode Island.

Continuing to build strong working relationships between colleges and universities and schools is, in our opinion, the direction in which we must continue to move.

In Rhode Island, the Board of Higher Education recently approved the establishment of a joint doctoral program in education, joint meaning utilizing all of the talent and experience we have at both our University of Rhode Island and at Rhode Island College.

The hallmark of that degree in debate and in development was that these people who go through this program will be practitioners, not another program for administrators but practitioners, people who will engage themselves in the classroom and in the schoolhouse at the practitioner's level. That is what we need.

I happen to hold a doctorate in physical sciences, and it was as a practitioner that I receive that, not as an administrator of physical science activities, and I think that is also a step in the right direction.

In summary, I think we have to develop and maintain a passion, the word that Representative Reed used, for the education of all children and for the education of poor children.

The crisis that we face in failing to do so demands passion, and it is not a passion that should be borne out of anything more but the love of this country and its future success, and in that regard, I wish to thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you, and I would be pleased to answer any questions, if there are any.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Petrocelli follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. AMERICO W. PETROCELLI, COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF HIGHER EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISAND

Senator Pell, Representative Reed, and distinguished guests, it is my distinct pleasure to testify at this jont hearing, sponsored by the House of Representatives Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts and the Humanities, on the topic of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. By inviting me to testify, I believe that you have underscored what should be one of the major features of all Federal legislation in the area of education, and which is a feature of the Clinton Administration's proposal, "Improving America's Schools," that higher education has an important role to play in helping to make schools better places in which to teach and to learn.

Increasingly, the boundaries between elementary and secondary education and higher education have become less pronounced and the wisdom of working across those boundaries more apparent. In Rhode Island, we have several examples of such partnerships. As you are aware, the Children's Crusade for Higher Education was initiated to encourage all children, especially those from low-income families, to stay in school and to make the transition into postsecondary education. The 2+2 Tech/Prep program at the Community College of Rhode Island helps students in technology areas bridge the gap between high school and college. The Rhode Island Skills Commission is developing alternative routes to help students move from basic education into programs that will help them train for careers. The recently approved joint doctoral program in education between the University of Rhode Island and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Rhode Island College is designed to have graduate students become engaged in addressing real problems in actual schools. These are but a few examples of the fforts underway in Rhode Island to develop collaborative efforts across the educational divide. This direction is emphasized in the legislation and should be promoted whenever possible.

From the very outset, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act identified education as a poverty prevention tool, because education offers the one real hope for low income children to move to greater affluence. If it is to work, poor children must be held to the same academic standards and be provided the same excellent teachers and facilities as their more privileged counterprts. Higher education has a role in this process by ensuring that those college students preparing themselves for careers in teaching have the capabilities and are provided the programs that will make them superb teachers. Higher education also has a responsibility to help practicing teachers hone their skills and to become educational managers who can provide their students with experiences and content that engage their attention and challenge their minds.

Consequently, Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the most important part of the legislation to higher education because it provides funding and encouragement for professional development activities. Rhode Island has a good track record of using Eisenhower funds to develop strong ongoing relationships between college faculty and elementary and secondary teachers in the area of mathematics and science. We would welcome the opportunity to expand these activities to include other content areas referenced in the National Education Goals. Our faculty members in education and arts and sciences have much to offer to the school reform movement and much to learn from this movement. Keeping higher education institutions and State offices of higher education as active partners in Title II is essential to promoting these relationships. The funding for Title II is also crucial; it must be increased if new partnerships are to be developed beyond those in the areas of mathematics and science.

Overall, the direction proposed for the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is appropriate and in keeping with much of the philosophy and many of the efforts here in Rhode Island. Continuing to build strong working relationships between colleges and universities and schools is, in our opinion, the direction in which we must continue to move. Providing Federal funding for designing and implementing improved professional development experiences for our prospective teachers and practicing teachers will strengthen and deepen these collaborative efforts. Therefore, we strongly endorse the proposed provisions in Title II.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to address you. I would be pleased to answer any questions that you might have.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, indeed.

Incidentally, in the course of the hearing, all the statements will be put in the record in full. So, if any of the witnesses care to abbreviate them, the full text will be included.

I have just one question. That is what particular lack or change would you make in the legislation if you were focusing on a single correction? What would you say, Mr. McWalters?

Mr. MCWALTERS. A correction?

Senator PELL. A change. That is a happier phrase.

Mr. MCWALTERS. I did not come—maybe it is because it has been reinforcing itself between the six national goals, the Goals 2000 kind of steps we are trying to take.

I was looking at this with a fear that the reauthorization discussion would not reinforce the other discussions. I was very pleased that they do reinforce it.

I am more in tune with the argument that says—there is only about 5 or—somebody—I think you said—6-percent leverage here, and yet, with that 6 percent or 5 percent, you are talking about the kind of fundamental redirection that I was suggesting when I spoke. We have never had the all-kids agenda. We have never met the test in that sense.

I would not restate it. I would not correct it. I would like that reinforced, the boldness of that statement, because I fear that we

are still—this issue that we are not doing it well—and there is this kind of, you know, flagellation about public education that I just think is unwarranted in terms of what we have been doing, but if we are going to do what we are now asked to do, the explicit relationship between the economy, the 13-to-1 versus the 3-to-1 and——

Senator PELL. Seventeen-to-one.

Mr. MCWALTERS. Seventeen-to-one. Now it is 3-to-1, and one of them is a minority.

That is raising the most fundamental issues that this country is going to ever face, and it is that part that I want brought out to the table. Rico said it a little bit as if we used to be able to—well, educators.

As a commissioner, I would like to think I have always—either me or my predecessors have always represented the all-kids agenda, but we raised it as kind of a—it's a moral issue, and it still is for me, but now I see this as a fundamental economic issue, and that is a radical change in the relationship, and it is not a good one.

I do not want to go on record as the person who said I want to produce cogs for the great industrial machine, but the truth is that is exactly what we did. Twenty percent of the students finish at high performance, 80 percent sort themselves out, and that met the needs of an industrial economy. So, I was in cahoots with the economy whether I ever wanted to say it or not.

Now that we are going to say all kids and somebody says why all kids, I would like to say it is because I always believed that, but the truth is it is because the environment, the economy, is now telling me we need all kids. That is the best news I have ever heard as an educator.

So, it is the all-kids part of this in explicit public policy that I think is the center of what you are trying to pull off with 5-percent leverage, more money.

Senator PELL. Commissioner Petrocelli?

Mr. PETROCELLI. There is—I would dearly like to see more emphasis on—you know, there is a lot of talk about involving partnerships and the community and parents groups, but we still have a very industry-directed legislation.

We speak about that, but meanwhile, in the communities, all over this country, there are people working very hard to attain those same set of goals.

I would love to find a way that those programs can be recognized and supported. They go hand in hand.

We have literacy programs. Literacy programs for adults are extremely important—that is the person you want to go home and deal with the child—and they really go around begging. They are all charity cases. They are talking to the national goals of this country. They exist, and we now create law that says wouldn't it be nice to stimulate the existence of such things, and we have to build a bureaucracy to make sure.

So, I would love to see some imaginative way that says, yes, you can come into a State like Rhode Island or Washington or elsewhere and recognize that there are people who have devoted energy and time, and they are successful. It cannot be measured very

easily. It does not need a great bureaucracy to uncover them. You probably sit on the boards, as honorary members, of all of them—and get some help into those groups that are working right at the grassroots level on their own volition. We ignore them, and that is one point.

When I mentioned earlier—I certainly did not want to offend any professional educators along the way—that it is the first time in our history that we must and that we never have—I just want to remind you, on a personal note, I should not—based on the 1930 model, 1932 model, I should not be sitting here giving testimony to you.

I should be cleaning looms in Pawtucket at Lorraine Mills on Middle Spring Avenue, because that is where my father was employed, and my father never went to school, and he was, by our standards, illiterate, and that is all it took to clean looms, and society would have demanded much better, that if I did not get educated, I could replace him.

Thank the good Lord that my father had the foresight to recognize that I should have been educated and the family structure to support that, because after the man died, he never even left me his job. They no longer have looms to be cleaned at the Lorraine Mill. I think it is an outlet for something.

The difference was that there was self-motivation within the family and self-motivation within the students. There was something to be gained, and there was something to be lost, and too many of our poor children right now have very little to lose, and what is keeping them in there, to a great extent, are the local volunteer groups that are dealing with them and their families to help them, and I wish—if I were to change one thing, I wish I could have a subtitle that says let us recognize the strength of that and just not give it an occasional nice word or a medal, let us give it some support against a set of standards.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, and we are welcoming some of these children who are coming in now to join the hearing. Welcome.

I will now turn to my friend and colleague, Congressman Reed.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Senator.

Peter and Rico, it is nice to see that Rhode Island has such competent and committed people who are articulately arguing for educational reform and, coincidentally, money.

Mr. MCWALTERS. Right.

Mr. REED. We are doing that in Washington, too.

Peter——

Mr. MCWALTERS. Yes.

Mr. REED. [continuing] you mentioned that one thing we need in terms of professional development is a more collegial approach, and it seems to me—and this is impressionistic—that a lot of our teachers feel isolated alone in a classroom, even within this building——

Mr. MCWALTERS. Right.

Mr. REED. [continuing] that there is not the structure where they can collaborate in a systematic way with their colleagues, with their principal as an educational leader, and that seems to me something that we want to change fundamentally.

Now, I would hope that this legislation will do that, and I would appreciate any insights you might have on how we do it better.

Mr. MCWALTERS. First, I want to reinforce your observation.

It is amazing to me that, in the traditions that we set up between managing schools and then the labor-management relationships, it is easy for us to talk about the "union" issue, but whether you are in a union system or not, there is a pervading structural question that the industry has systematically set up over a long period of time, and that is the phenomena where, if you go into most schools in this country, you will still find it that, when the teacher finally goes in the room, they close the door, and they put a piece of paper over the little window.

That is not a union-dictated behavior. I do not know where it came from, but we have got it, to the extent that one of the greatest threats—and I do not mean physical threats, just one of the greatest threats in the conversation is getting that door open in a nonjudgment, nonsupervisory way and getting the conversation going about good practice.

So, even though we are an industry people—we are a people industry, we are not bricks—for some reason, we are tremendously isolated.

Now, that means, to me, when you talk about how we go there—I do fear, quite honestly, that the preoccupation with the broken system and this tremendous impatience, both in the political sense and in the economic sense—we have got to fix it quick; even though it took us 150 years to create it, we have got to have it fixed next week—that, in that, this issue of collegial and/or development will be a short-term—kind of, okay, we gave you a couple of months to talk about it, is it done yet?—and it will turn into something that I consider, under the accountability rubric, a heavyhanded professional intervention, and if you know Linda Darling Hammond and that kind of person, the research suggests that a very, very bad thing to do when you are trying to really retool a system.

The trick is how do you set up a system that actually encourages and supports high risk if, on the other hand, you are talking about, well, gee, you tried it, but it did not work, you are out.

I think that is—I have tremendous fears that the needed—and I agree, we need systems that are done—that do not just change the margins. We are talking systemic fundamental change.

That means high risk, that means involvement, that means risk, that means professional access to each other like nothing we have ever seen, and yet, at the same time, it is not something that can be done without people sitting down and agreeing in a compact or—and I do not mean contract in the labor-management sense but in the accountability sense, good faith, that says this is not in the margin, folks; we are ready to be explicit, we are ready to report out publicly, but we need access to ourselves.

Beyond that, Congressman, I think it is the same old issues. You have got to believe that we have met the enemy and it is us, that we are the most compassionate group.

We are the only industry left that even deals with children. The family is breaking up. The church is in question. The social service system is in disarray, some would say.

Every day, in this country, we get up, we dress our children, we ship them off to schools, and by far and away, we are still the most stable and compassionate and competent group dealing with that.

We have got to find a way to respect that and get access at the very—at the table where teachers exist, and I do not think most of us yet know enough about that. We do not spend enough time there.

Mr. REED. Just a quick followup. My sense—and again, impressionistic—is that that ethic you have talked about, that wanting to get together, exists in the teaching community.

Mr. MCWALTERS. Look at the PROBE survey in Providence. I mean if there is any doubt about that, that put it to bed for me, and that just reinforces anecdotal information we all have.

I think teachers are more at the edge of this discussion than most of us are, but we have not found the institutional mechanisms to bring it to the table in meaningful and substantive ways. I agree.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Rick, a question. Since you are representing, as you do so well, higher education and you have a tremendous role in the education of teachers and the continuing development, I am wondering whether or not the higher education system is prepared to—I hesitate to use the term—give some sort of iimited warranty to school systems that the people that they send into the school systems and their graduates are ready when they arrive but, more importantly, will have access back to the higher education system to be—to continue to do that.

I know there are financial questions here about who pays for it and everything else, but one vision of a new system is a system in which a teacher leaves, graduates from their preparatory university or college, but never leaves that college and university behind, because it is always there as a reference point and a source of guidance, and I wonder if you could comment or elaborate.

Mr. PETROCELLI. I think we definitely have to move in that direction. Keep in mind that colleges and universities give a bunch of professional degrees which have a great implied warranty to them.

When we produce a chemist, we turn that chemist loose on the world with the warranty that they are not going to destroy it, hopefully, that they know what they are doing, a medical technician, and in many of those areas, there is a tight bond that continues in that professional area back to continuing education, so to speak.

I think that same implied warranty has to be assessed once we put our hands in higher education and say this is a teacher for you.

I have always been struck by the difference between the Japanese system and our system which allows so much in-service training time for its elementary/secondary teachers, as opposed to the very minimal amount of time that we allow, and I was always somewhat dismayed, ever since I was a school committee person 20 years ago, that the encouragement for teachers to continue was not always heavily focused on their disciplines. That is why I made the reference to administration.

Rhode Island says you must have a Master's degree. Well, a great number of those Master's degrees are in educational administration, but whose fault is that? Is that the teachers' fault?

I really blame higher education to a great extent. We are the ones who offered those kind of classes.

Senator PELL. Could you hold the microphone a little closer?

Mr. PETROCELLI. Oh, yes.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

Mr. PETROCELLI. If I may just make comment, Representative, based on the fact that it was apparent that both Peter and I were asking for more money.

Mr. REED. I would be disappointed, Rick, if you did not.

Mr. PETROCELLI. Yes.

Mr. MCWALTERS. I was trying to be clear.

Mr. PETROCELLI. I just think that the terms we have to come to, since this is one of the few areas that truly deals with the future of the country—that is, what character will the country have in the character of its citizens—this is really not an expense, but it is an investment, and if we can somehow think in those terms, then the policymakers, I think, will have a clearer time.

We have shown studies in Rhode Island time and again on the impact of the Pathways to Progress program by which poor single parents are encouraged to go to college.

There is a difference, a swing of nearly $300,000 in the lives of those children depending on whether or not they get educated or do not get educated, $300,000 of contribution or $300,000 of aid.

So, somehow we must come to terms with the idea that this is a sound investment which any capitalist businessman would make if they understood the terms, and if there were a way we can fund out of endowment concepts, so that the return that is sure to come offsets the future expenditures, I think it would be well worth the while, and it is not an investment that can be put off forever.

We are making a very large investment, but if we continue to focus in those terms, get off the idea that this is just another expense, I think we will be well served, the policymakers will be well served.

Mr. MCWALTERS. Congressman, I just wanted to point out something about the higher education connection and reinforce the critical nature of this, and I have heard these statements made and I have come to believe them, but we have—again, we created an industry where, the day you get certified and tenured, you—it is a—where else in something of a professional nature is that also a license to stop? I mean how did we ever do that?

Again, that is nobody's fault, but we have set up a system where there is a terminal point to the expectation of continuous learning—we have got to change that—and then, when you look at all the money that is spent in the cycle of a rat race to "get the credential" and that is not fundamentally connected to schools? We are not using master teachers as routinely in universities? We are not demanding that the university experience be fundamentally connected on a research discussion to schools.

So, there is an enormous structural change that, if we can get at that one, it will affect this issue of collegiality and lifelong learning and bring the professional richness to the classroom that right now is lost in the images that, even in our industry, somehow it is better to be a high school teacher than a second-grade teacher.

That is wrong, and there is a powerful structural thing we need to work out here.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Congresswoman Unsoeld.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you, Senator Pell.

I want to take advantage of your expertise, but it means straying somewhat from the topic, but maybe you have given me the invitation by talking about the need for systemic fundamental change and the all-kids agenda. So, let me try this.

Eighty two percent of those occupying beds in our prisons are high school dropouts. Forty percent of the kids coming to school for the first time are unprepared to learn.

What role is there at the Federal level and in our public school systems for early childhood education? What do you recommend?

Mr. MCWALTERS. Well, I obviously recommend that we have universal access, particularly for those who need it the most, since the research—we feel embarrassed that the research is so clear. The public policy decisions have actually already been made, as in a strategy, and yet, we do not invest in it. So, clearly, from three to five is critical.

The whole issue now of prebirth—I mean the whole issue of well babies and the whole—as a matter of fact, I have said—and I mean this, but I do not mean it as a research statement—there is every reason to believe now, looking at the demographics of performance against social class and investment, that you could shut down America's secondary schools and give a test in September of the ninth grade and one in June of the 12th grade and you would get the same line.

I am not suggesting we do not learn, but you would not change the who gets what. That is quite contrary to the early grades.

You give me a world-class fourth-grader—and I do not believe this country cannot do that. We can produce a world-class fourth-grader, and the rest—it does not solve itself, it never will, but it will radically change the system of trying to compensate for a system that has failed versus providing real equal outcomes and access to children as they hit the puberty years and that kind of thing, radically different.

Something that frightens me, though, in this discussion is that I have been sitting here talking about all kids, high standards, but remember, some parts of this proposal acknowledge that we need to focus and concentrate the money where the children need it most, and I agree with that, but as soon as you focus this kind of resources, if the 5 percent is focused in the most urban or most needy places, it further alienates the system that does not think it is broken and basically says this is an urban problem, and I have some concerns that that—that this kind of split in our culture would be reinforced not by your intentions but by the limited resources you bring and your attempt to go to where it is needed the most.

Mr. PETROCELLI. It is a poverty problem.

Each and every year I look at the SAT scores, and I do not have great value placed on them as predictors of performance, but at least they are a comparable measure of things, and I feel com-

fortable that I could predict anybody's SAT scores in America if you tell me the family income.

Year after year, it is a straightline relationship, so straight a line that, if someone had turned that in as a scientific thesis, the major professor may have thought they fixed the data points.

We have got to deal with that, and that data, interestingly enough, transcends every other criteria. Whether it is urban or non-urban or the west coast or the east coast, there is a straightline relationship between the poverty level of the family and the SAT scores.

So, in stressing all children, there is no question that that encompasses these poor children from poor families.

It is a very difficult place, America, to be a child, and that is the root of our problem, and we may fix the buildings, but we have got—that is why my earlier plea that those youngsters who deal—those volunteer groups that deal—what is essentially early education—be encouraged, and further, to get back to my other earlier plea, when it works, let us do it.

How can every economist tell us that Head Start has a return on investment that is so gorgeous and we still only reach 25 percent of the folks?

What is a country thinking of when it does that, when those workers are essential to pay our future retirement benefits?

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, indeed, for being with us, and we will alternate the presiding of the panels. It is now the turn of Congressman Reed, my colleague on the same committee.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much.

Mr. PETROCELLI. Thank you.

Mr. MCWALTERS. Thank you.

Mr. REED. We would like to get started again, if you will, because the Senator and Representative Unsoeld and I have to catch a plane back to Washington this afternoon.

The second panel is composed of Dr. Ted Eddy and Dr. Ted Sizer. Both of them are preeminent experts in the field of education reform—Dr. Eddy, the former President of the University of Rhode Island, and Dr. Sizer of Brown University, the Coalition for Essential Schools—and we are very glad that they are here today.

We are waiting to change the tape and let the children observe the intricacies of cable television.

Once again, we would like to resume the hearing with the second panel, composed of Dr. Edward Eddy, former President of the University of Rhode Island and now the chief architect of the PROBE report for the Providence School Department, and Dr. Theodore Sizer from the Coalition of Essential Schools, and Dr. Eddy, would you please begin, and I can remind you that your statement will be in the record. So, if you would like to summarize, that would be entirely appropriate. Thank you, Dr. Eddy.

STATEMENTS OF EDWARD EDDY, CHAIRMAN, PROVIDENCE BLUEPRINT FOR EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND; AND THEODORE SIZER, CHAIRMAN, COALITION OF ESSENTIAL SCHOOLS, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Dr. EDDY. Thank you very much.

81-246 O - 94 - 3

Senator Pell, Representative Reed, and Representative Unsoeld, the observations I am going to make are based on an exciting and, hopefully, fully productive experience of the past two years on the front lines of school reform.

In Providence, we have completed, under the close guidance of an independent 32-member citizen commission an examination of an urban school system which well may be the most thorough ever undertaken.

The PROBE, Providence Blueprint for Education Commission, made 39 recommendations for sweeping reform, from attitudes and techniques in the classroom to selection of the school board, from priorities for principals to grievances over broken sinks.

Our State newspaper, the Providence Journal, has been particularly thorough and accurate in its coverage of the PROBE study and of the efforts toward implementation. Thus far, the Journal has published over 40 articles and nine editorials on Providence school reform.

I mention this media coverage and the subsequent widespread community concern because our assessment and move to reform have gained ownership of a far wider segment of our community than one usually expects or even hopes for.

PROBE has been endorsed by the Mayor, City Council, School Board, Superintendent, Teachers Union and now its national executive, Albert Shankar, parents and community groups and the business community.

All of this is just a prelude for our first word of advice to you.

On the basis of our experience, we urge you to use this piece of Federal legislation to encourage strongly independent community-based assessments of the schools and community-based reform. Only when a community itself finds out what is wrong will it start to do what is right. The best system of schooling is one which comes out of the community in response to identified needs, not one which is imposed by either State or Federal Government.

We have learned through PROBE that each school should have its own personality, should be owned by the teachers and the parents, should be responsive to the needs of its particular constituents, not those of an anonymous office in Washington or in the State capitals.

Of course, there must be some measure of uniformity and transferability, but it is the life and spirit within the individual school which gives it vitality, not the statistics on the desk of a government officer.

Right now, the Providence schools are owned by more segments of the community than probably at any other time in their recent history. Providence has reclaimed its schools.

The Chamber of Commerce, for instance, took the unprecedented step of pulling $200,000 from its carefully accumulated endowment fund to support for the first two years a fund-raiser/grant-writer for the city's schools in the hope of tapping national funds for innovative reform programs, and a dozen corporations, banks, and businesses thus far have come forward with grants for innovative school reform.

My second point is to urge you to keep the steady eye of the legislation fixed on the crucial central interaction of the individual teacher and the individual student.

Do not play the systems game with Federal legislation. Do not attempt to institutionalize education either through the State government or the Federal Government. Keep it straight and simple. Do only what will encourage better teachers and better students.

Four years from now, be ready to defend each segment of the legislation on the sole measure of how it helped the kids in the classroom, not how many scores went up or how many times a system responded to Federal reports.

To that end, and thirdly, I urge you to provide funding for added development assistance and training for teachers through the schools. Only 24 percent of Providence teachers in our survey felt that they had adequate input in fashioning professional development opportunities. I speak especially of those traditional teachers who may not be in touch with the traditional students. By traditional students, I mean those who come from parented homes locked in American ways of living and coping. According to the Mayor's office, in Providence alone, for example, almost one-third of all current students were not residents of the United States three years ago.

A traditional teacher needs all kinds of guidance if she or he is to respond effectively to those non-traditional students and to their parents or surrogate parents.

This could include more training and encouraging active learning in the classroom, or it might mean acquiring a new language, such as Spanish, for example.

Whatever it is that the teacher needs, it should be identified and a program set up by the teachers themselves, preferably in their individual schools.

We have had enough professional development designed and mandated by absentee educators. School-based, teacher-designed professional development is the route to follow.

To do this, as well as many other important tasks, will require more teacher time for planning and interaction. We were shocked to discover that the average Providence principal spends only 150 minutes a year working with his or her faculty in planning and in swapping ideas. That is the equivalent of five minutes per week.

We have permitted a myth of supposedly desirable separation and individual freedom to end up isolating teachers. Professionals in all other occupations interact regularly. So should teachers, and they must have the time to do so.

Finally, from our study of one city's schools compared with other comparable districts, we urge you to fund systems of evaluation for school personnel.

Over 60 percent of Providence teachers responded to our survey. Eighty nine percent of the respondents stated that teacher incompetence is not addressed in the schools, and why? Because frankly, no one in education, at all levels, has yet devised a good and effective fair way to evaluate teacher performance. This, to my mind, is a serious national concern.

You could contribute mightily to education at all levels by encouraging sound, realistic research and experimentation into fair but thorough methods of evaluation of performance.

I am not going to take your time to restate my themes but only to note that, right now, I think you have the rare opportunity to do something truly significant in education, because there is so much foment throughout the Nation with regard to school reform, but you must route Federal programs through the schools and their communities, encouragement by all means but not control.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Eddy follows:]

STATEMENT OF DR. EDWARD EDDY, CHAIRMAN, PROVIDENCE BLUEPRINT FOR EDUCATION, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

The observations I am going to make are based on an exciting and, hopefully, productive experience of the past two years on the front lines of school reform. In Providence, we have completed, under the close guidance of an independent, 33-member citizen commission, an examination of an urban school system which may well be the most thorough ever undertaken. The PROBE, (Providence Blueprint for Education) Commission, made 39 recommendations for sweeping reform—from attitudes and techniques in the classroom to selection of the School Board, from priorities for principals to grievances over a broken sink.

Our State newspaper, the *Providence Journal*, has been particularly thorough—and accurate—in its coverage of the PROBE study and of the efforts toward implementation. Thus far, the Journal has published over 40 articles and nine editorials on Providence school reform. As a result of the media coverage and the subsequent widespread community concern, our assessment and move to reform have gained ownership of a far wider segment of our community than one usually expects—or even hopes for. PROBE has been endorsed by the Mayor, City Council, School Board, Superintendent, Teachers Union (and now its national executive, Albert Shanker), parents and community groups, Commissioner of Education, and the business community.

All of this is just a prelude for our first word of advice to you. On the basis of our experience, we urge you to use this piece of Federal legislation to encourage strongly community-based assessments of the schools and community-based reform. The best system of schooling is one which comes out of the community in response to identified needs, not one which is imposed by either State or Federal Government. We have learned through PROBE that each school should have its own personality, should be owned by the teachers and the parents, should be responsive to the needs of its particular constituents, not those of an anonymous office in Washington or in the State capitals. Of course, there must be some measure of uniformity and transferability—but it's the life and spirit within the individual school which gives it vitality, not the statistics on the desk of a government officer.

Right now, the Providence schools are "owned" by more segments of the community than probably at any time in recent history. The Chamber of Commerce, for instance, took the unprecedented step of pulling $200,000 from its carefully accumulated endowment fund to support a fund-raiser/grant-writer for the city's schools for two years in the expectation of tapping the national pool for innovative, reform programs. And a dozen corporations, banks, and businesses have come forward with funding for special projects and programs.

My second point is to urge you to keep the steady eye of the legislation fixed on the central, crucial interaction of the individual teacher and the individual student. Don't play the systems game; don't attempt to institutionalize education. Keep it straight and simple: Do only what will encourage better teachers and better students. Four years from now, be ready to defend each segment of the legislation on the sole measure of how it helped the kids.

To that end, and thirdly, I urge you to provide funding for added assistance and training for teachers, especially of those "traditional" ones who may not be in touch with the non-traditional students. By "traditional students," I mean those who come from parented homes locked in American ways of living and coping. According to the Mayor's office, in Providence alone, for example, almost one-third of all current students were not residents of the United States three years ago. A "traditional" teacher needs all kinds of guidance if she or he is to respond effectively to the non-traditional students and to their parents or surrogate parents.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This could include more training in encouraging active learning or it might mean acquiring a new language. Whatever it is that the teacher needs, it should be identified and set up by the teachers themselves, preferably in their individual schools. We have had enough professional development mandated and designed by absentee educators. School-based, teacher-designed professional development is the route to follow.

To do this, as well as many other important tasks, will require more teacher time for planning and for interaction. We were shocked to discover that the average principal in Providence spends only 150 minutes *a year* in planning and in swapping ideas with his/her faculty. We have allowed a myth of separation and supposed freedom to isolate teachers. Professionals in all other occupations interact regularly; so should teachers. And they must have the time to do so.

Finally, through our study of one city's schools compared with other comparable districts, we urge you to fund systems of evaluation for school personnel. Over 67 percent of Providence teachers responded to our survey. Eighty nine percent of the respondents stated that teacher incompetence is not addressed. Why? Because no one in education—at *any* level, I would claim—has yet devised a good and effective way to evaluate teacher performance. You could help education at all levels by encouraging sound, realistic research into fair but thorough methods of performance evaluation.

I won't take the time to restate my themes but only to say that you have a rare chance in a time of educational reform to do something truly significant if it is kept at the school and community level.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Dr. Eddy.

Dr. Sizer?

Dr. SIZER. Thank you.

Let me express my appreciation to Senator Pell and Congressman Reed for the invitation to participate in this hearing and to welcome Congresswoman Unsoeld to Rhode Island.

I am delighted you are here in the apple season. I suggest, as a Congresswoman from the State of Washington, you sample the superior fruit that comes from New England trees.

Let me focus quickly on professional development and to do so in general rather than drawing from particular parts of the Act.

Let me begin with some very simple truisms.

We learn what we want and need to learn, and the more intensely we require some particular knowledge or skill, the more assiduously do we seek it.

We learn what we use.

Good teachers are proud people. A profession which trusts its practitioners attracts and holds proud people.

No two good schools are ever quite alike.

No good school is precisely the same from one year to the next.

Truisms, common sense. What do these say about professional development?

They say to let the precise people who require the new knowledge and skills to decide what those might be and how they wish to gain them.

It is to expect to see how these new knowledges and skills, to some sensible degree, ultimately play out for the benefit of the school, most particularly its students.

It implies that government keep a very light hand on control of what one might call the input; that is, do not ensnare applicants for moneys in a welter of stipulations and regulations.

It means being deliberately flexible, encouraging different sorts of professional development from even apparently similar schools.

Again, my text is fuller, and let me just, in precis form, reflect on what these truisms and their implications might mean for public policy.

It means that money is given to the people who have immediate and compelling reasons to need it, the same message that you received powerfully from President Eddy.

It means that professional development be directly connected with school reform, that professional development is not only for the individual. It is for the individual as part of the collectivity which is a school faculty.

It means that professional development is organized around what we know about learning, about incentives, about learning what one needs to know, whether the learner is a child or an adult.

It trusts the people for whom the professional development is targeted to decide what that opportunity will be. It trusts them, the most powerful and least-used word in American education.

It sensibly changes the roles of the governmental units above the individual schools—that is, the districts, the States, the colleges and universities, the Federal Government—from directors—thou shall do this—to nurturers: Here are powerful ideas, let us link arms and see whether those ideas can play out on behalf of youngsters.

Finally, it asks that the investment in professional development lead somewhere professionally in the observable practice of the schools and in the education of the students.

This evaluation is not so much in whether the participants in it liked the professional development programs, which is a common barometer now, but whether, in fact, the schools are different because of them.

It is on this point that I have particular concern in the shape of the current legislation before us and the overarching umbrella legislation introduced by the Clinton administration, is that we are all for standards, we are all for shifting the attention of policy folk, of parents, of teachers, of school boards to output.

The danger in the current moment is that the definition of that output, the youngsters' display of their mastery of these standards, can be easily and grotesquely distorted and trivialized.

The reduction of what is in my child's heart and head to a 30-minute test with a numerical score is trivialization. Further, it is distortion, is that much of the testing in this country that goes on now does not tell us accurately what we need to know and, as the record clearly shows, often hurts kids.

Further, there is no evidence that closely-aligned—and this is a word from the Act—systems of accountability, of goals and standards and tests and regulations, work. If they did work, the State of New York's schools would produce kids dramatically more competent than those in the other 49 States. As you know, through the regents, there has been, in fact, a closely-aligned rational, in a sort of philosophical sense, but clearly ineffective system.

Furthermore, as we have seen in the quite unseemly howling and screaming among the Washington association establishment, every special interest group wants to get its thing into the national goals before they are locked into law, and what we are seeing is a politicization of the standard-setting which has a lot to do with peo-

ple's sense of their professional dignity and not an awful lot to do with kids, and so, I urge you, as Peter said, as Ted Eddy said, put a very, very light hand on the definition of standards, both at the State and the Federal level, or we will end up with trivial standards.

If we believe in rigorous standards, they have to come, as Ted Eddy said, from the people who have a stake in them, and that is mom and dad and the teachers and the folks in an individual school, and so, I think we should—as we move toward higher standards and a different way of looking at these matters, we have to attend very carefully to the flashing yellow light which says the very rational system of top-down control, even when shrouded with rhetoric about school-site authority, has not worked, and the evidence from all sorts of quarters, including, for instance, the recent Rand study on Chapter 1 funding—it has not worked.

Further, all of us responsible for children have to remember that public education is the one institution in this society which the citizen is compelled to do, with the exception, of course, of the military draft in times of war, but if government is to compel young children to go to school, then government must be very, very sensitive to the rights of parents, to the rights of communities.

Government should be, above all—and the Federal Government, in particular—a powerful persuader but not a mandator.

The Act, as it is unfolding, as Peter McWalters pointed out, represents the possibility for a major breakthrough of a different way of looking at a fine old institution which has outlived its time, but as we move ahead in shaping this Act, I beg you to attend to history of centrally-controlled standards, whether in this country or in others, attend carefully to it, and to attend very carefully to the voices of those represented here but all across the country who know that the movement for really engaged and rigorous learning has to start and has to end at the most local level, the individual school.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Sizer follows:]

Professional Development and the Federal Role

by Ted Sizer

Let me express my appreciation to Senator Pell and Congressman Reed for the invitation to participate in this hearing. Let me also welcome Congresswoman Unsoeld from the other coast, to Rhode Island.

We meet today to discuss the professional development of educators, and the role in this matter which the federal government might best play.

Let me begin with some simple truisms.

We learn what we want and need to learn, and the more intensely we require some particular knowledge or skill the more assiduously do we seek it.

We learn what we use.

Good teachers are proud people. A profession which trusts its practitioners attracts and holds proud people.

No two good schools are ever quite alike.

No good school is precisely the same from one year to the next.

What do these homilies imply for the professional development of teachers and other school professionals?

Let the precise people who require the "new knowledge and skills" decide what those might be and how they wish to gain them. That is, give the lion's share of the professional development money to the individual schools and let them decide how to deploy it. At all costs avoid tokenism and de facto patronage ("We had some teachers on this district professional development committee and they spoke for all teachers"... "The district level union professional development committee decides what the teachers want".... "The legislature will mandate what the teachers know and lock their promotions and salary increments to their 'getting' this at the local universities".....)

Expect to see how those "new knowledges and skills", to some sensible degree, ultimately play out for the benefit of the school, most particularly its students. That is—again, to some sensible degree —expect to see that "new knowledge and skills" in use, not primarily for purposes of evaluation but as a signal that the investment in "new knowledge" is being exercised, shaped, adapted, enriched—fundamentally *used* —in the repertoire of the professional.

Keep a very light hand on control of the "input". That is, don't ensnare applicants for moneys in a welter of stipulations and regulations which the "donor" insists must guide the applicants. Give them room. Assume that they know better than you do what is best for their students and thus for themselves. Trust them. And then watch their schools and their students sensitively but carefully thereafter.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Be deliberately flexible, expecting—indeed encouraging—different sorts of professional development plans from apparently "similar" schools. Give incentives for a school's faculty members to sit together, to decide on their genius, their needs, their hopes, their plans, and to come up with a plan to meet them. And never assume that any school stands still, that its "needs" are forever fixed or its direction immovable.

Grant some money directly to individual professionals, these sums large enough to allow individuals to undertake pieces of serious work or study. (That is, allow for the fact that even small professional groups—a school's faculty—can easily suffer from tyrannies of the majority). And assign some moneys to the districts and states to use to prepare themselves to respond to what the individual schools may request, and, too, to frame arguments and evidence and examples about "better" practice and more sensible, rigorous work.

What might this mean?

It *gives the money to people who have immediate and compelling reasons to need it*, to use it well and to attend to its fruits.

It asks that *the investment lead somewhere professionally*—in the observable practice at the schools and the education of the students. The "evaluation" then is not so much in whether the participants "liked" the professional development programs delivered to them (a common barometer now) but in whether their schools are different and better for them.

This "output" aspect can be easily and grotesquely trivialized ("Test scores must rise at least 1% each quarter...") or left hopelessly in the grip of public relations snake oil ("See how happy the children are...."). However, the matter of assessing the effect of this professional development is no more or less difficult than assessing the "goodness" of schools in general: it has to be handled in a manner as sensitive as it is rigorous, and as attentive to time and context as it is to some basic standards.

It *connects professional development directly with school reform*: The faculty decides what it needs to know to get ahead with its own renewal or redesign. The redesign has to reflect the practical implications of the "use" of the "new knowledge and skills".

It *organizes professional development around what we know about learning*—learning whether by children or adults.

It *trusts the people for whom the professional development is targeted* to decide what that opportunity will be. As we learn by examining the way we administer schools, we Americans believe that teachers are poor judges of what they need to know. However—sad to say—everyone else is probably even a worse judge. How can I, sitting in the district office, or the state capital or in Washington, possibly know as well what a school and its professionals need better than they do? To believe that I do is an act of breathtaking arrogance. The widely-held low opinion of professional development of teachers and principals nationally at the least suggests that those of us who presume to know better and who have kept control of these matters for so many decades show some much needed humility in face of that sobering evidence.

It sensibly *changes the roles of the governmental units above the individual schools—the districts, the states, the colleges and universities, the federal government, from directors to nurturers*. It puts them in the role of

supporters, of teachers-on-demand, of goaders with new ideas, of leaders toward worthwhile practice—but always as persuaders and not commanders. Their role here is more of Martin Luther King Jr than of Napoleon. To lead by persuasion is subtler, more time consuming, more intense—and, given the nature of schooling and learning where the key matters are almost all in the hands of the adult closest to the child—far more effective. That is, delegation of authority for the shape and control of educational professional development is not only respectful: it is also coldly efficient.

Schools will not improve unless those who do the daily work in those places want change to happen and are willing to shoulder the risks and heartaches and joys of pressing that change. If we want better schools in this country we have to support the only people who ultimately can make it happen: the professionals on the line.

This will take some doing: Americans have a long habit of demeaning those who work with children, whether they be teachers or principals or mothers. The hierarchy--the district and state offices for professional development, the university people like myself—has its dignities to defend, and a lock on the money. The kind of shift I am suggesting here may square with common sense and the record we have compiled in our work with schools quietly signals the need for profound reform, but the changes suggested here will still be vigorously attacked.

More is the pity.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much, Dr. Sizer and Dr. Eddy.

I would like to begin with a question. We are in the process of a reform movement with Federal legislation, locally with the PROBE report, locally with efforts throughout every community in this State, one way or another.

I think it would be helpful to sort of envision what the ideal solution might be, even understanding it is a long road to that solution, and I am sensing from both your comments—and I would like you both to respond—that, in the best system, you would have a principal in a school who is an education curriculum leader, who is actively engaged with his or her faculty, and helping the faculty developing themselves as much as they are developing children. This is contrary to the model that we see today, and I wonder if you could just elaborate on whether that is an accurate sort of vision of where we might be going and any other advice as to how to get there.

Dr. EDDY. Well, I think one of the most unfortunate aspects that we uncovered in the operation of the schools in the PROBE study was to discover that the principals all wanted to be what you are talking about, the leaders, and all hoped to be, but they were engaged in activities such as supervising the lunchroom, which became a far higher priority because of the circumstances in which they were placed.

As a matter of fact, I talked to one principal just a few minutes ago who left because she had lunch duty at her school and could not stay, and this became much more important to most of them or talking with—than talking with parents, than talking—evaluating teachers goes way down the line in terms of the time they can give and the activity and so forth.

The Superintendent in Providence has mandated that principals spend this coming year—that principals visit the classrooms and talk with the teachers about their evaluation at least twice during the year.

I do not know how they are going to do it, frankly, if they continue in their round of disciplinary activities and of supervising the lunchroom and making sure everybody gets on the bus.

We call them, in Providence, building administrators, and I think that is what they are, building administrators. We do not have educators in the school system. Many of them are capable of being educators, but we do not really have educators. We have building administrators.

Mr. REED. Dr. Sizer?

Dr. SIZER. I will say it for President Eddy. He did not have to supervise the cafeterias at URI on a daily basis.

Dr. EDDY. Not daily.

Dr. SIZER. Only when there were food fights.

I think there are two States that should be looked at carefully. One is the State of Rhode Island, where the Board of Regents for Elementary and Secondary Education, led by Pete McWalters, have evolved a wonderful reciprocal conversation between individual schools and school districts in parts of the State and the State authorities working collectively in developing loose but important frameworks of standards and beginning to get some focus with the

initiative fundamentally at the local level and the evolution of how those standards might be addressed coming from the local level.

One of the great values of a small State is that we can have a conversation from east to west and north to south, and I think the importance of the small governmental unit and how it can be resourcefully done—that is, the claims of the State and the claims of the parents the locality can work out, and I think the Nation should be looking very carefully at what is evolving here.

The other State which is moving in a different direction is New York, a much larger State, where the regents there and Commissioner Sobel, in association with a wide variety of schools, is moving toward an accountability system which works not on centrally administered tests or elaborate lists of things to cover—indeed, the New York system was rejected, and the new direction brought—the fact that it is happening in New York makes it particularly interesting.

It is a combination of the display by individual schools of students' work, not the tokens of the work in the form of tests but the real work, the real writing, the real science, defended orally and using videotape, and the examination by outsiders of this real student work, combined with an American variant on the British system of inspection.

One of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, David Green, is on the staff now in Albany and is looking for a way, in that State, with Commissioner Sobel, to accelerate and to enrich local control, at the same time to have a system where truly incompetent work is quickly identified and dealt with.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much.

Senator Pell?

Senator PELL. Thank you.

As you may be aware, I have long advocated there be more hours that our students go to school, and we have, as you know, the statistics. The days are now, in our country, 180 days a year school. The rest of the year is vacation. In the Soviet Union, it is 210; Sweden, 200; Canada, 200; South Korea, 220; Japan, 243, et cetera.

Also in our country, we have 16,000 school districts, of which half have less than 1,000 students. Isn't this almost a question of too much local authority? Shouldn't the standards really be set on a more central system?

With every other educational system, it has far less local control than we do. I realize this is not a popular thing to advance, but from the viewpoint of the education of our children, I wonder if we would not achieve a better result with more hours and more days in school and with more centralized standards.

Dr. SIZER. Well, the number of days required for attendance in public schools are set by State authorities, not by local authorities. I agree that we in this——

Senator PELL. Excuse me for interrupting, but the curriculum is set by the local school communities.

Dr. SIZER. In some States, and in an increasing number of States, it is set directly or indirectly, in the most powerful ways, through State textbook adoptions, for instance, in Texas and California. The locals have far less authority or they seize—they do not seize authority—than might first be apparent.

I think we need to—I think, on the question of time, there are two issues: one, how much of the existing time do we use well, and I think the answer is not much—it is harsh to say so, but I think the research would bear that out—and secondly, we need to be far more serious about how much our kids tend to schoolwork during the course of a year.

The United States is the only country that has a significant number of its high school kids in the labor force during the school year. Sixty percent of high school kids are working regularly for pay for strangers during the school year, and when I go abroad and mention this to kids in foreign schools, they cannot—how could you possibly work at McDonald's and do your homework?

The same applies to the political pressure for teenage employment during vacation times, is that there is, as other States have found, a great deal of pressure to hold that 180 days, because who is going to be the lifeguard? Who is going to man the beaches at Cape Cod, just to pick on Massachusetts and not Rhode Island beaches.

So, I think, Senator, it is a collection of things that all go back to the fact that we really do not respect schooling. We do not respect hard intellectual work for our kids, and we are quite prepared to say we do until we have to hire somebody or until it is too much to keep pushing the kid.

So, I think it goes right to the fabric of our values, and the bully pulpit in the Congress and in the State legislatures is very important to change these values, and the extent to which hearings like this raise the stakes for all of us, folks on the street, is going to be, in many respects, probably the most important contribution of this Act.

Senator PELL. Just to comment there for a moment, I am struck by the fact that, when you talk to a high school class—and I do it quite often—I always end up asking the kids how many of you feel that you have been working to capacity, how many feel you could work more if properly challenged.

Almost every hand goes up to say they have not been working to capacity, they could do more if they were challenged. It is an experiment that any of us who are interested in teaching should try, and the result will come out that way.

Dr. EDDY. We modeled after your experience, Senator Pell. We inserted that question in our survey of students in Providence, and it bore out what you have testified.

They want more homework, but they also want more than just hours of homework. They want more challenging work. They want more active learning.

They want—they do not want to be lectured ad nauseam. They do not want to be talked to all the time. They want to be a part of the learning process.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Mr. REED. Mrs. Unsoeld, questions?

Mrs. UNSOELD. No. I appreciated the panel, but I will pass.

Mr. REED. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Dr. Sizer and Dr. Eddy, for joining us today, and our next panel will convene in a few moments. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Senator PELL. This joint hearing will come to order, and our first witness in this panel will be Brother Daniel Casey, who represents the Schools of the Catholic Diocese for this area.

Brother Casey.

STATEMENTS OF DANIEL F. CASEY, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS FOR THE CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND; COLLEEN BIELECKI, SIXTH GRADE TEACHER AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANT, NORTHERN LINCOLN ELEMENTARY, LINCOLN, RHODE ISLAND; SHIRLEY CHERRY, LIBRARIAN, PORTSMOUTH HIGH SCHOOL, PORTSMOUTH, RHODE ISLAND; DORLA LONG, FOURTH GRADE TEACHER, MATUNUCK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, SOUTH KINGSTOWN, RHODE ISLAND; AND ANDREA MATTIA, FIFTH GRADE TEACHER, HEAD TEACHER, EDMUND W. FLYNN SCHOOL, PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND

Mr. CASEY. Thank you, Senator Pell and Representative Reed, Representative Unsoeld.

I am very happy for the invitation to speak, not only on behalf of Rhode Island Catholic Schools but for the private independent schools. I think my testimony says that Rhode Island CAPE is an active chapter in the national group.

We have nearly 100 private schools in Rhode Island, despite the size of the State, two-thirds Catholic and about one-third private independent.

If you had a more leisurely schedule, Community Preparatory School is right nearby, a private independent school serving about 60 to 80 talented inner-city students, and Bishop McVinny School is also nearby, K to 8, serving about 450 neighborhood children.

I also think it important maybe in the context not only of the State but nationally that I speak to one thing about Catholic schools, that our enrollments are increasing. Last year and the year before, 36 of the 50 States reported enrollment increases in Catholic schools, particularly at the elementary level.

Rhode Island is the same. We had 400 more Catholic elementary school students last September than we did the year before, and hopefully, we will report another enrollment increase when our statistics are in for this year.

Much of that increase is in the urban inner-city areas, and the faces of Catholic school children are dramatically changing to represent the minority populations of our cities.

For example, here in Rhode Island, I believe the statisticians are projecting 100,000 Hispanic residents by the year 2000 or something to that effect, and that is clearly mirrored in all schools and especially in Catholic schools.

Senator PELL. That is in Providence alone, not counting Central Falls, Pawtucket——

Mr. CASEY. No, I am talking about Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, sections of Cranston, even Woonsocket, West Warwick, Newport.

Senator PELL. Thank you.

Mr. CASEY. So, whenever we talk about the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act and disadvan-

taged children, I guess the comment is just to destroy the myth that Catholic schools are for the affluent and to clearly State that poor people can pay for their children's education if they choose to do so, and that is happening all over the country and here in Rhode Island.

Another thing I would like to mention on Chapter 1—I was principal of a Catholic inner-city high school in Brooklyn for 10 years, and we had the largest Chapter 1 program of any non-public school in the city. Half of our entering class of 300 freshmen were eligible for Chapter 1 services.

We had eight Board of Education teachers fully employed in the school, and 9 percent of those youngsters went on to postsecondary schools, and I found the Chapter 1 program remarkably effective in that one concrete instance on the border of Bedford-Stuyvesant and Brooklyn.

Now, since Felton, obviously in any religiously-sponsored school in the United States, the Chapter 1 program is being implemented primarily through offsite—very, very few—and computer-assisted instruction. We have some good computer programs here in Providence and Pawtucket. It is not the best, but it is all that is doable given the Felton decision.

Another concern I have—and it is tied in with the reauthorization, and it is local to Rhode Island and possibly a few other States—that the rigorous application of the Felton decision to other federally-funded programs—Chapter 2, drug-free schools—and that has happened in our State, and we have negotiated, cooperated Chapter 2 programs and other Federal programs using the thinking of the Felton decision, in other words that Federal moneys cannot be spent on any person that has direct contact with children, that all of the Federal moneys have to be spent in other ways—materials, teacher in-service, but no direct contact.

So, my fear is that, in any reauthorization, that the impact of any Federal education funding on Catholic schools and other religiously-sponsored schools would be further inhibited if the language of the Act does not stress equity and comparable services to both public school students and private school students.

The National Science Foundation—and this is not an example of Federal funding, but it is an example of what can happen. There was an $8 million to $10 million grant given to Rhode Island and, I think, four other States primarily for teacher in-service.

Now, all private schools in Rhode Island were excluded from that program. We are now trying to get our own grant, you know, independent of that, but I guess the main point of my testimony—and I am not going to read it—is that, in any reauthorization, the equity be primarily considered, private schools and public schools, and that it not be so complex that it is very, very difficult to fit the Catholic school youngsters into the program.

As far as school improvement in Chapter 2, we find the program, since we have always been into school-based management in Catholic schools—the Chapter 2 program is remarkably effective for Catholic schools because of its flexibility.

I have a staff of four for about 17,000 students. We rarely, if ever, get involved in the Chapter 2. It is the local principal and the

teachers and sometimes the parents who determine how they are going to use the Chapter 2 funds.

Now, I would not like to see that change by some complicated process and the flexibility is decreased in the reauthorization.

I think I have about used up my five minutes. So, I guess if I said anything, it would be to keep the principle of equity in mind for Catholic schools and other private schools in Rhode Island and throughout the country.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Casey follows:]

Presented By

[redacted]

Good morning, Senator Pell, Congressman Reed and members of the House Education and Labor Committee and the Senate Subcommittee on Education, Arts, and the Humanities on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the reauthorization of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I am Brother Daniel F. Casey, Superintendent of Schools for the Diocese of Providence. I am speaking for Bishop Louis E. Gelineau, for the more than 1400 educators who operate 44 Catholic schools in Rhode Island, and for the more than 17000 students and their families who support these schools with their financial sacrifices, their time and their labor.

For the past forty-one years I have been a De La Salle Christian Brother, a Roman Catholic religious order of lay men who conduct schools at all levels in eighty-one countries throughout the world. I did my undergraduate work at the Catholic University of America in Washington and graduate work at Georgetown and Boston College. I have taught at both the elementary and secondary levels and have been principal of four Catholic high schools (Boston, Brooklyn, Portsmouth, RI and Addis Ababa, Ethiopia). For the past seven years I have been the Catholic School Superintendent for Rhode Island.

I am also a member of the board of the R.I. Council for American Private Education (CAPE). R.I. CAPE is a coalition of the private schools in the state. While I am not formally representing CAPE, the issues I am raising are concerns of the CAPE leadership.

I will begin my presentation with a set of principles and a summary of concerns. I believe these principles should guide the inclusion of private schools in ALL federal education programs.

1. **Five Principles**

We support the National Education goals and the idea to provide systemic reform of all schools so that all students receive quality services so as to be better prepared to meet high standards and to respond to the challenge of the technological world of the 21st century. We recommend that the administration's recommendations include specific statutory language to include private schools in all deliberations leading to such reforms whether these take place on the Federal, state or local level. We also recommend that proposed legislation relating to reform, ESEA and OERI reauthorization contain specific language to the effect that where services are provided to eligible public school students and staff these services are provided in an equitable and comparable way to their private school counterparts. Finally, where the concept of flexibility is advanced we recommend that specific language be provided in the statute to protect the equitable delivery of services to private school students and staff.

2. **General Issues**

The integration of Federal programs is only acceptable with provisions to safeguard the equitable delivery of services responsive to the specific needs of private school students, even where they differ from those of their public schools counterparts. There can be serious difficulty in allowing more financial flexibility to the states. This is especially critical in states with "Blaine Amendments" or statutory requirements barring aid to private schools or calling Federal funds state funds once given to the state. Such flexibility is not acceptable and a provision of a "set aside" so funds for private schools students would remain Federal funds is absolutely necessary.

We would favor relaxation in the supplement/not supplant provisions. We favor the provision of Federal technical assistance to public and private schools agencies. We support a greater emphasis on performance over compliance, provided private schools are involved in the development and implementation of such performance assessments.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Chapter I

We do not support changing Chapter I from aid to individual students to one assisting general school reform without specific language protecting the equitable and comparable delivery of services to our students.

We would support professional development activities for all teachers in order to enhance instructional practice and student learning. We believe student assessment should include a wide variety of approaches including such acceptable procedures as portfolios, teacher assessments and testing programs of a variety of approaches. Chapter I can better address the needs of all eligible students and especially secondary students by the full funding of Chapter I, and in particular the funding of the Secondary Schools Programs (Part C-Sec. 1101 of Chapter I) of the 1988 reauthorization of ESEA, is needed if this goal is to be accomplished.

4. Chapter II - School Improvement Programs

Chapter II is a program generally viewed by both the public and private school communities as an effective and useful vehicle for school program improvement. We have consistently opposed proposals that might impact negatively on the program. We cannot support efforts to combine Chapter II with general reform efforts without specific provisions to protect the equitable and comparable participation of private schools, their students and staff.

One of the greatest benefits of the current Chapter II is its flexibility Due to restrictions in Rhode Island on the use of Chapter II funds in the wake of the Supreme Court Felton decision, more and more Catholic schools in Rhode Island have targeted teacher inservice programs as the road to school improvement. In recent years Chapter II funds have been used in Catholic schools in Rhode Island for inservice programs in the areas of whole language, the new national mathematics standards, middle school curricula, and cooperative learning. A number of Catholic schools use their Chapter II funds to participate in teacher inservice programs sponsored by the various public collaboratives. Given the meager financial resources of Catholic schools, Chapter II provides these schools with invaluable teacher inservice opportunities; such opportunities would be impossible to offer without Chapter II funding.

5) Safe and Drug Free Schools

Efforts under the Drug-Free Schools program should focus on drug related issues (e.g., prevention, training, rehabilitation, etc.) rather than on broader health and safety issues. The status should be changed to allow the SEA to apply if an LEA does not (see sec. 1372(a)(2)); and LEA's should be required to make all drug-free program curricular materials available to private schools.

6. Bilingual Education

The specific needs of private school students, even where they differ from those of their public school counterparts, need to be provided for.

7. Collaborative Efforts

We recommend that the administration initiate an on-going, broad-based and comprehensive dialogue about the overall needs of our nation's children. All systemic reform proposals will impact directly or indirectly on private schools and their students. Therefore it is critical that the professional experience and expertise of the entire educational community, public and private, join in all levels of any collaboration intended to improve educational instruction and students learning for all of our nation's young people.

8. [illegible]

We support the approach that all true educational research should look at all aspects of the teaching, learning situation in order to provide practical suggestions to improve instruction and learning. We support gathering and using all such information in the total educational community--both public and private.

I have included a letter from Sister Lourdes Sheehan, SSND, Secretary for Education for the United States Catholic Conference which states her position on Chapter II in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I thank you for this opportunity to provide input into the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Sincerely,

Brother Daniel F. Casey

Brother Daniel F. Casey, F.S.C.
Superintendent of Schools

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC CONFERENCE
Department of Education
Office of the Secretary
3211 4th Street N.E. Washington, DC 20017-1194 (202)541-3130 FAX (202)541-3322 TELEX 7408424

September 30, 1993

SCHOOL OFFICE
SEP 30 1993
RECEIVED

Brother Daniel F. Casey, FSC
Superintendent of Schools
Diocese of Providence
One Cathedral Square
Providence, RI 02903-3601

Dear Brother Daniel:

I appreciate your testifying before Senator Pell's field hearing in Rhode Island on Monday, October 4, 1993.

In response to your request for the position of the United States Catholic Conference on Chapter II in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I am forwarding the following statement which I request that you submit as testimony for the committee's record.

"Chapter II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, benefits all children attending public and private, nonprofit schools. This provision supports and enhances educational programs through a variety of activities. Private school students and teachers receive benefits through the Local Education Agency (LEA) after required consultation to determine the needs of the private school participants.

"One of the greatest benefits of the current Chapter II is its flexibility. LEA's and private school representatives determine local needs and select from among a wide range of programs.

"Chapter II and its predecessor programs, Title II, are the only federal assistance programs which consistently provided equitable benefits to nonpublic school students and teachers throughout the 28 year history of ESEA.

"Therefore, the United States Catholic Conference joins with many colleagues in the public and private school communities to support the provisions of Chapter II which allow the necessary flexibility to address the local needs of all students and faculties. We believe in the need for staff development but would not like to see Chapter II funds limited to this one need."

Thank you for your leadership.

Sincerely,

Lourdes Sheehan, RSM
Secretary for Education

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, indeed.

Now we turn to Colleen Bielecki, who is the sixth-grade teacher, Professional Development Consultant of the Northern Lincoln Elementary School in Lincoln.

Ms. BIELECKI. Thank you, Senator Pell.

Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, and Congresswoman Unsoeld, I really do appreciate the opportunity to speak to you as a sixth-grade teacher in the Town of Lincoln and as the Director of Professional Issues for the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers.

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act is very important to us, and I agree with Senator Pell's earlier comments that the focus of the current administration on the development of higher standards and the national goals is creating a very important time for us to look at the reauthorization of Chapter 1, so that we can enable poor children, as well as all children, to achieve those high standards.

As we advocate for changes in Chapter 1, I think it is very important for us to recognize that children who have long been engaged in Chapter 1 programs have made great gains. However, many of those gains have been in basic skills.

While we look to increased standards and expectations for all students, it is very, very important that we also raise those expectations for poor children and that we give them the supports that they need in order to meet those expectations.

I have been a teacher for 20 years in both regular and special education settings, and I have long been troubled by remedial pull-out programs, and unfortunately, much of the Chapter 1 service that is provided to students is of that nature.

In my work with Rhode Island school districts for the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers and for the last two years with the Rhode Island Skills Commission, I have also seen the need for systemic education reform, rather than hit-or-miss, one-shot efforts usually aimed at trying to take care of the things that other people tell us, as Peter McWalters told us earlier, are wrong with education, when we know best, I think, at the school site the kinds of supports that we need to help our children achieve high standards.

When we take a look at the Chapter 1 legislation, I think that, first and foremost, that idea of helping students achieve high standards is a very important one.

We know, and it is has been stated here today, that there is an emerging national consensus that we must improve education through systemic education reform that has as its foundation rigorous content and performance standards for all students and assessments to measure the progress of students toward those standards.

I think that it is very important that Chapter 1 become a part of this movement to achieve high standards for all students.

Once we have those rigorous standards set, however, Chapter 1 programs must be aimed and held responsible for helping students achieve them. Chapter 1 has to move away from remedial pull-out programs that are basically basic-skills-driven.

These programs often focus on drill and practice. Very often, they have very little connection with the instruction that is going on for most of the student's day, and in fact, very often, only reach those children for 20 to 30 minutes a day.

We believe that, if we could better increase the integration of Chapter 1 programs with regular classroom instruction, that not only would it help the students in Chapter 1 programs, but it would also help their classmates, many of whom are just as deserving of that kind of instruction, to reach high standards.

As a regular classroom teacher in a Chapter 1 school, I must tell you that I have often been frustrated by what I know is a program that is designed to help children but very often does things that puzzle me.

I am puzzled by the red tape that is involved in this program.

I am concerned by an eligibility process that, as a teacher, sometimes I feel excludes children who are just as deserving, and as a classroom teacher, I have seen too many times children pulled out from my reading class to attend reading remediation programs, missing time in the very class that they are struggling with.

The students in those classes are frustrated, too, although sometimes they are not too unhappy about being pulled out of my class and the instruction that is going on there. However, it is a struggle for them, when they return 20 or 30 minutes later, to try to catch up with what has been going on in the regular classroom. That bothers me terribly.

I am also concerned—and the Chapter 1 teachers appear to be just as concerned—about the fact that we have little or no time for consistent collaboration, that it is very difficult for us, as we face the hit-or-miss methods that we have to use, to align the instruction for the students that we share.

Many Chapter 1 programs are now beginning to improve the integration of Chapter 1 in regular classroom instruction. Teachers are beginning to work collaboratively and rely less on pull-out, but in many cases I feel that the current legislation discourages this practice, and I would like to see that changed.

There should also be a greater emphasis on problem-solving and critical-thinking skills utilized in Chapter 1 instruction, and I think that this should, too, be encouraged through the legislation.

However, in order to improve Chapter 1 programs and student achievement, a strong commitment must be made to meaningful staff development that is not limited to just Chapter 1 teachers but is available to all teachers, administrators, and support staff in our schools.

We cannot advocate for changes in programs and methodologies, we cannot ask professionals to blend programs that previously existed in isolation without giving them the time and the tools to do so.

Funds must be available to Chapter 1 schools and LEAs to design professional development opportunities that are related to the content standards we spoke about and aimed at improving curriculum, assessment methods, and instructional practices.

We need ongoing opportunities for those teachers, the support staff, the administrators, and yes, the parents, too, to improve their knowledge and their skills, to develop collaborative relationships, and to have time—which is a luxury, let me tell you—to discuss students' work.

Funds must be provided through this legislation for release time for teachers to work on curriculum development, to observe and

learn from one another, to be trained in effective teaching methodologies, to be supported as they do so.

There must be connections, as we stressed earlier, made with higher education institutions to support new teachers as they enter the profession and provide opportunities for them to learn from master teachers. I cannot stress strongly enough the need for time as well as funding for those opportunities.

Additionally, I believe that those programs should not be prescribed from the top down. Once again, I am reiterating things that you have already heard this morning, but it is very important that decisions about staff development and the providers of that staff development be made at the school site.

We must go further than providing lip service for funding and providing for staff development. The commitment has to be serious, and it has to be well-funded.

Too often, my colleagues and I are asked to respond to new education initiatives. In my 20 years, I have seen many of them, and most of the time, we are not afforded the support and the training necessary. We are not afforded the time to try and sometimes fail and eventually succeed as we work toward helping our students achieve the highest standards possible, and far too often, the funding for staff development is the first thing that is cut when States and local school districts face financial difficulty.

A quick example of that is a program that I have been involved in since 1985 called the Rhode Island School Staff Institute. For the last two years, I have served as Chair of that advisory board.

Every year since 1985, Rhode Island School Staff Institute has provided funds of up to about and sometimes exceeding $150,000 a year for local staff development, designed by teachers, parents, and administrators.

The programs have been exceedingly successful. They have been evaluated, and those evaluations have proved them to have impact on classroom practice. However, unfortunately, in the last year, due to the fiscal crisis in Rhode Island and cuts to the education budget, this program has been eliminated.

We are hoping to revive that program this year, but I cite it as an example that programs that work, particularly programs that involve money spent for teacher development, for parental development, and administrative, teacher, and parental collaboration are often cut. That should not happen, and I think that now you have an opportunity to change that.

I fully support the position of the American Federation of Teachers that at least 20 percent of new Chapter 1 funds above the current funding level be used for staff development and that these funds be augmented by State dollars.

I think that does more than provide just funds for staff development. It sends a very clear signal that this is a serious commitment to staff development in helping teachers and students reach high standards.

In summary, it is my hope that we will use our opportunity to revise Chapter 1 to raise expectations for Chapter 1 students and schools and all students.

I hope that this new legislation will encourage the development of rigorous content and performance standards for all children that

will guide instruction, challenge all students, including poor children, to reach their highest potential.

I also hope that a variety of assessments will be used, including performance assessment, and a move away from that one-shot, 30-minute, fill-in-the-bubble test to measure the progress of Chapter 1 students in schools on more than just basic skills.

I hope that the legislation encourages emphasis on problem-solving and critical thinking and will move away from just basic skill development, but most of all, I strongly advocate for that serious commitment to staff development, evidenced by appropriate funding and recognition of the time needed for sustained professional development experiences.

President Clinton has said that we do not have a person to waste. The reauthorization of Chapter 1 should ensure that we do not waste a single student as we raise educational standards.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Bielecki follows:]

Statement of Colleen Bielecki

MR. CHAIRMAN AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE:

My name is Colleen Bielecki, and I am a sixth grade teacher in Lincoln, Rhode Island, and the Director of Professional Issues for the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers. I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to comment on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA). With the focus of the current administration on the development and achievement of national educational goals and the development of higher standards and expectations for all students, the time is right to consider changes in Chapter 1 that will increase educational opportunities for poor children.

As we advocate for revision of Chapter 1, it would be a mistake not to acknowledge the success of this Act which, since 1965, has become the largest federal education program, reaching one student out of nine and 64 percent of our nation's schools. Children engaged in Chapter 1 programs have made significant gains in basic skills. However, as we aim to increase expectations for all students, we must make changes in Chapter 1 that will shift the focus from a narrow basic skills curriculum to a program that ensures that poor children are also encouraged to reach high standards.

As a teacher for over twenty years in both regular and special education settings, I have long been troubled by remedial pull-out programs. In my work with Rhode Island school districts for the Rhode Island Federation of Teachers and the Rhode Island Skills Commission, I have seen the need for systemic education reform rather than "quick fix" projects and short-term solutions. As chair of the Rhode Island School Staff Institute, a state-legislated program to provide funds for grassroots staff development, I have witnessed the benefits to teachers and students of school-based training. My recommendations for revision of Chapter 1 are based on those experiences.

First and foremost, Chapter 1 must ensure that high standards are set for all students, including students involved in Chapter 1 programs. This is consistent with the emerging national consensus to improve education for all students through systemic education

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

reform that calls for setting clear rigorous standards for student achievement and creating assessments that measure student progress toward meeting those standards. Chapter 1 must move away from its current emphasis on basic skills and become part of the move to ensure that all children are given the same opportunity to learn according to high standards. By encouraging states to develop demanding content and performance standards for all students, school districts would be discouraged from allowing separate or lower standards for Chapter 1 students or schools.

Once high rigorous standards are set, Chapter 1 should move away from remedial, pull-out, basic skills driven programs. These programs often focus on drill and practice, have little connection with what is being taught in the student's regular class, and only reach students for 20-30 minutes per day. An increased emphasis on improving the integration of Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction would reduce the fragmentation of Chapter 1 instruction and the isolation and stigmatization of Chapter 1 students. It would enable Chapter 1 programs to supplement regular class instruction and decrease the amount of lost instructional time experienced by children in pull-out programs.

As a regular classroom teacher in a Chapter 1 school, I have long been frustrated by problems associated with a program designed to help children. Too often, students are pulled out of reading class for Chapter 1 reading remediation--losing time in the very class they are struggling with. The Chapter 1 students themselves are often frustrated by being pulled out in the middle of a lesson and forced to "catch up" when they return thirty minutes later. Additionally, because there is no time built into the schedule for consistent collaboration, both the Chapter 1 and regular classroom teacher are frustrated by their "hit or miss" attempts at aligning instructional efforts for the children they share. Many Chapter 1 programs are beginning to focus on improving the integration of Chapter 1 and regular classroom instruction, and placing a greater emphasis on critical thinking and problem-solving skills. I believe that all students in Chapter 1 schools would benefit from increased funding for school-wide projects and an emphasis on improving curriculum and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

instruction based on rigorous content standards. This will enable Chapter 1 to focus more on prevention of school failure than on remediation, and lead to higher achievement for Chapter 1 students and their classmates.

However, in order to improve Chapter 1 programs and student achievement, a strong commitment must be made to meaningful staff development that is not limited to Chapter 1 teachers, but is available to all teachers, administrators and support staff. Funds must be available for Chapter 1 schools and LEA's to design professional development opportunities that are tied to the rigorous content standards and aimed at improving curriculum, assessment methods, instructional practices and classroom management skills for all school staff.

The goal of staff development should be to help teachers utilize effective, research-based methods to support students meeting high standards. Effective staff development is not what most school staff have experienced to date--one shot workshops that may or may not be connected with the needs of the teachers, students, or schools, and usually have no follow up and very little real impact on classroom practice. Instead, on-going opportunities for teachers, support staff, administrators and parents to improve their knowledge and skills, to develop collaborative relationships, and discuss students' work must be provided. Funds must be allocated to provide released time for teachers to work on curriculum development, to observe and learn from one another, to be trained in effective teaching methodologies and supported as those methods are implemented, and to exchange ideas and information about effective teaching practices. I cannot stress strongly enough the need for time, as well as funding, for those opportunities. Additionally, rather than being prescribed from the "top down", decisions about staff development programs and providers should be made at the school site by the staff involved, linked to the standards and responsive to the needs of the particular school and district.

However, we must go further than just giving "lip service" to providing for staff development. The commitment must be serious

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and well funded. Too often teachers are asked to respond to new education initiatives without the support and training necessary, and then are blamed when those programs are less than successful. And far too often funds for staff development are the first thing to be cut when states or local districts face financial difficulty.

One example of that kind of decision making occurred here in Rhode Island this year. Since 1985, the Rhode Island School Staff Institute has provided in excess of $150,000 a year to local staff development initiatives. The staff development programs were designed at the local level by and for teachers, administrators and parents. Evaluation of the programs proved them to be highly successful and effective. In fact, the program grew to be so successful, and funding so sought after, that the monies ran out more and more quickly each year, and applicants began lining up with proposals as soon as they could be submitted. The program was clearly having an impact on training and instruction and on the involvement of practitioners in designing staff development to meet local needs. Unfortunately, due to the fiscal crisis in Rhode Island this year and reductions to the education budget, the decision was made to eliminate funding for RISSI. We hope to revive the program, but I cite it as an example of how staff development programs are often the first things eliminated when difficult budgetary decisions are made.

I fully support the position of the American Federation of Teachers that at least 20 percent of new Chapter 1 funds above the current funding level be used for staff development and that these funds be augmented with state dollars. In addition to providing necessary funding for staff development, this would send a clear signal regarding the critical nature of professional development in helping students reach high standards.

It is my hope that we will use this opportunity to revise Chapter 1 to raise expectations for Chapter 1 students and schools. I hope that new legislation will encourage the development of rigorous content and performance standards for all children that would guide instruction and challenge all students, including poor children, to reach their highest

potential. I would like to see a variety of assessments, including performance assessments, developed. The assessments should be based on the standards and used to measure the achievements of Chapter 1 students. I hope those standards will also guide the transition of Chapter 1 programs from basic skills remediation to an emphasis on critical thinking and problem solving, and a move to a more integrated instructional design. I also strongly advocate for a serious commitment to staff development evidenced by appropriate funding, and the recognition of time needed for sustained professional development experiences. Finally, I hope the legislation allows for greater emphasis on school-wide programs and the inclusion of teachers, administrators, support staff, and parents in training activities and collaborative experiences that would lead to greater achievement for Chapter 1 students and their classmates.

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

Ms. Shirley Cherry, who is the Librarian at the Portsmouth High School, Portsmouth.

Ms. CHERRY. Thank you, Senator Pell, Representative Reed, Representative Unsoeld.

My name is Shirley Cherry, and as Senator Pell said, I am the Librarian of the Portsmouth High School. I am entering my 19th year there.

I am representing NEA Rhode Island, which represents about 8,500 education employees, and we are the State affiliate for NEA.

I was told by Mr. Mike Dannenberg that I should feel free to interject wherever I would like.

So, I would like to—before I make the points that I would like about the specific areas of the legislation, I would just like to interject that I am a testimony that one can come from abject poverty and free lunches to valedictorian of her class and can sit before this committee.

So, I am—as I talk, I would just like to make sure that we know that there must be a strong support from Federal Government for public education.

There must be a feeling that education is as important as our national health care and our national defense, because it is through public education that we will ensure that the Nation remains competitive in a global economy.

Federal education funds should be directed to the local level where the students meet the teachers, where the action is.

We must also make sure that these funds get to areas where they are most needed. We cannot continue to match young boys and girls from poor neighborhoods, who only have paper and pencil if they are lucky, up with well-to-do students who have computers.

The uses of Federal funds should be determined primarily at the local level, with decisionmaking to include teachers, their bargaining agents, and parents in a major role.

To accomplish the goal of getting more Federal money directly to the local districts, we believe that general aid is the best way to go. It could be used for a large variety of programs, which would be determined at the local level.

For example, a district might choose to use the funds to create the ability to make use of modern technology and telecommunications technology such as computers and additional phone lines.

Federal funds might be used to recruit and retain good teachers by providing in-service and staff development programs, increasing teachers' salaries, or establishing school-site-based management.

School buildings and facilities might be improved by using Federal funds to make schools safe from environmental hazards or to make general repairs and upgrades on the buildings.

Furthermore, a local district might choose to use program money to focus on dropout prevention or English as a second language or the prevention of teen pregnancy.

It might also focus on school-based health clinics or increasing the number of counselors and school psychologists or school social workers, and I think it is an important point that this legislation has also focused on the homeless, on homeless children, and also on the youth who are incarcerated. I think that is extremely impor-

tant, and it is extremely important also that the legislation is focusing not only on young people who are incarcerated but the employability of young people who are incarcerated when they are removed from those institutions. I think that is extremely important.

In addition to general aid, we believe that special assistance must be given to poor, rural, and urban schools, and from a rural standpoint, I am sure about that, because I taught in the schools in Alabama and Georgia in the early 1960s, and I did work in the rural section, and I know that ESEA money can make a difference in that kind of school.

Bills addressing these concerns have been introduced, and we would like to see them become a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Impact aid should be forward funded, as other Federal education programs are. We believe the impact aid formula should be weighted in order to meet students' educational needs. We think the money should go where the greatest need is.

Schools should be safe and drug free, as the sixth National Education Goal specifies, and we absolutely oppose the use of Federal funds for non-public schools.

As I proceed now to my remarks about the specifics of the Clinton proposal for an ESEA reauthorization bill, I will mention the points where there are references to the use of public funds for non-public schools.

Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act emphasizes content, performance, and assessment standards, but we should not lose sight of opportunity-to-learn standards as well.

The formula for Title I concentrates funds on high-poverty counties, and we think that that is a noble attempt.

While the attempt to provide more funding to areas of high poverty is noble, in our view, an unfavorable result of the formula change is that it decreases the money available for students within pockets of poverty in more affluent communities. This needs to be satisfactorily adjusted.

An additional concern that we have about Title I is that it contains new language regarding the diversion of public Federal funds to non-public schools. We would like to see this language removed.

Title II of the legislation has been rewritten to include professional development for teachers in the core subject matter areas of English, mathematics, science, geography, history, and art. We believe this is an excellent component of the bill.

However, it requires a local fund match, and some of our poorer schools may not be able to make that match even though there is a provision that other Federal moneys may be used to help make the local match.

Under the existing Chapter 2, the use of grants is determined primarily at the local level. We would recommend that this be continued and that it is an excellent approach, and it should be funded through large authorizations of general aid.

Title III stresses the need for effective educational uses of modern telecommunications technology, and we think this is an excellent proposal. However, the bill should include a requirement that such technology be compatible from school building to school build-

ing, from district to district, and from State to State in order for it to be efficiently utilized.

In Title V, there is a provision for magnet schools that does not explicitly mandate that they be public schools. We urge that any designated magnet school be a public school.

Title V also deals with public school equalization and provides States with technical assistance, research assistance, and the development and dissemination of model materials.

We do not believe that this comes anywhere close to addressing the need for resources to provide equal opportunities for poor rural and urban local education associations, and it will not bring them into comparison with well-to-do schools.

The NEA proposes that general aid of $100 million be used to help resolve this issue.

The NEA opposes the provision of Title VIII that would eliminate impact aid funds for students in the Part B category, and this refers to students whose parents live or work on a Federal site. We also advocate that impact aid be forward funded and weighted.

With regard to Title IX, we believe care should be given when granting broad waivers of regulations and authority so that the large intent of the education programs is not lost.

Title IX also provides for services to private school students and teachers. We feel strongly that this is unnecessary and should not be covered by this Act.

With the exception of Title I, which authorizes $7 billion to be appropriated, all other titles are authorized as "such sums." We believe that definite figures should be applied in the place where "such sums" is used.

Before I make my final comment, I would just like to say that I know that Representative Reed's office has told me that they are going to focus on staff development, and I think all good education programs begin with well-trained staff, but I think a component in staff development that is often overlooked—we make sure that we know the content area, usually, but we need to make sure that all teachers are sensitized to the needs of human diversity, and I thank you for this opportunity to make these comments. I hope I have not bored you. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Cherry follows:]

Statement of Shirley Cherry

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, I am Shirley Cherry, Librarian from the Portsmouth School system and member of the National Education Association Rhode Island, which represents more than 8,500 education employees. NEA Rhode Island is this state's affiliate of the National Education Association. I appreciate the opportunity to offer some comments on the "Improving America's Schools Act of 1993," which is legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. To begin, I would like to offer a few summary comments about what improvements NEA Rhode Island would like to see in elementary and secondary education. Then, I will make points about a few specific areas in the bill.

As we think about how to improve public education, I hope we will all bear one overriding idea in mind. There must be a major financial commitment from the federal government for public education. Education is as important as national health care and national defense in ensuring that our nation remains competitive in the global economy. Federal education funds should be directed to the local level, where the students meet the teachers -- "where the action is." The uses of federal funds should be determined primarily at the local level, with decision making to include teachers, their bargaining agents, and parents in major roles.

To accomplish the goal of getting more federal money directly to the local districts, we believe general aid is the best way to go. It could be used for a large variety of programs, which would be determined by the local education agency in concert with teachers and parents. For example, a district might choose to use the funds to create the ability to make use of modern telecommunications technology such as computers or additional phone lines. Federal funds might be used to recruit and retain good teachers by providing inservice and staff development programs, increasing teachers' salaries, or establishing school site-based management. School buildings and facilities might be improved by using federal funds to make schools safe from environmental hazards or to make general repairs and upgrades on buildings. Furthermore, a local district might choose to use federal general aid funds to address special needs through programs focusing on dropout prevention, English as a second language, prevention of teen pregnancy, school-based health clinics, or increasing the number of counselors, school psychologists, and social workers.

In addition to general aid, we believe that special assistance must be given to poor rural and urban schools. Bills addressing these concerns have been introduced in Congress, and we would like to see them become part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Impact aid should be forward funded, as other federal education programs are. We believe the impact aid formula should be weighted in order to meet students' educational needs.

Schools should be safe and drug free, as the sixth National Education Goal specifies.

We absolutely oppose the use of federal funds for nonpublic schools. As I proceed now to my remarks about specifics of the Clinton proposal for an ESEA reauthorization bill, I will mention the points where there are references to the use of public funds for nonpublic schools.

Title I of the Improving America's Schools Act emphasizes content, performance, and assessment standards. We should not lose sight of opportunity-to-learn standards as well. We hope these will be included as part of the bill. The formula for Title I concentrates federal funds on high-poverty counties, high-poverty local education agencies (LEAs) within the counties, and high-poverty schools within the LEAs. While this attempt to

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

provide more funding to areas of high poverty is a noble one, in our view, an unfavorable result of the formula change is that it decreases the money available for students within pockets of poverty that exist in cities and counties showing lower poverty rates. This needs to be satisfactorily adjusted. An additional concern we have about Title I is that it contains new language regarding the diversion of public federal funds to nonpublic schools. We want to see this language removed.

Title II of the legislation has been rewritten to include professional development for teachers in the core subject matter areas of English, math, science, geography, history, and art. We believe this is an excellent component of the bill. However, it requires a local fund match. Poor schools cannot afford this and therefore have the potential for being eliminated from participation, even with the provision that other federal money may be used to make the local match. Under the existing Chapter 2, the use of grants is determined primarily at the local level. We would recommend continuation of this excellent approach through a large authorization for general aid.

Title III stresses the need for effective educational uses of modern telecommunications technology, an excellent proposal. However, the bill should include a requirement that such technology be compatible from school building to school building, from district to district, and from state to state for its most efficient utilization.

In Title V, there is a provision for magnet schools that doesn't explicitly mandate their being public. We view this as a serious omission and urge that it be corrected to specify that only public schools may be designated as magnet schools. Title V also deals with public school equalization and provides states with technical assistance, research assistance, and the development and dissemination of model materials. We do not believe this comes anywhere close to addressing the need for resources to provide equal opportunities for poor rural and urban LEAs in comparison with more well-to-do schools. The NEA proposes general aid of $100 billion to help resolve this issue.

The NEA opposes the provision in Title VIII that would eliminate impact aid funds for students in the Part B category. This refers to students whose parents live or work on a federal site. We also advocate that impact aid be forward funded and weighted, as I've mentioned.

With regard to Title IX, we believe care should be given when granting broad waivers of regulations and authority so that the large intent of the education programs isn't lost. Title IX also provides for services to private school students and teachers. We feel strongly that this is unnecessary and shouldn't be covered by this act.

With the exception of Title I, which authorizes $7 billion to be appropriated, all other titles are authorized as "such sums." In our view, that doesn't provide the appropriations committees with the proper authority and therefore tends to result in the receipt of little or no money. This is a serious flaw that needs to be corrected by authorizing specific funding amounts.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to express our views of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1993. NEA Rhode Island and I look forward to continuing to work with you to improve public education.

Senator PELL. Not at all.

We now come to Ms. Dorla Long, who is a fourth-grade teacher in the Matunuck Elementary School in Matunuck.

Ms. Long.

Ms. LONG. Thank you, Senator Pell, Representative Reed, Representative Unsoeld.

It is a rare opportunity that I get to share my views on staff development with somebody that is associated at the national level. My comments will be based primarily on my personal experiences with the staff development program in the South Kingstown School District.

I hope to provide you with some information on the range of opportunities provided to meet the needs of our teachers. I will describe how these activities are selected and planned.

I will identify the characteristics common to our most successful programs and the concerns I have regarding future staff development at the school district and individual school levels.

A wide variety of staff development opportunities are available to all the teachers of Rhode Island. Universities and colleges in Rhode Island offer regular and summer courses to learn about current curriculum methods and materials.

Our State Department of Education has provided many opportunities of growth, particularly through its literacy initiative.

Professional associations, including the Reading, Math, and Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, provide conferences and workshops to keep Rhode Island's teachers abreast of effective instructional practices.

Teachers in South Kingstown participate in these programs, as well as the district's comprehensive program. Even with all these opportunities, the demands on teachers exceed the present training being offered.

Gifted, remedial, and handicapped students that were once pulled out of regular classrooms are now a part of mainstreamed classes. We need programs that will help teachers deal with special populations of students that were once segregated from our classes.

In our multicultural society, we need programs that will help us reach students of all ethnic and cultural backgrounds. We need programs that incorporate technologies that will help our students function in a modern world.

In South Kingstown, staff development is accomplished through many activities that are supported and encouraged by the administration and school community.

In-service programs are offered after school and on release time days. Teachers are given professional days to attend conferences, visitations to other schools, and workshops.

Many of our teachers perceive attending workshops and courses on a regular basis a necessity to better their own performances. Those with advanced degrees also receive compensation through an advanced salary scale. The district requires six approved credit hours of further study every five years to maintain a teacher's advanced ratio salary.

Our in-service program provides a range of opportunities that are based on the philosophy of our system to produce responsible citizens committed to lifelong learning.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Course offerings include specifically designed programs to meet the needs of our parents and personnel, including aides, maintenance, teachers, and administrators.

To determine the program to be offered each year, information is gathered from staff needs surveys on specific topics which individuals feel need to be addressed.

Next, a representative committee of teachers, support staff, and administrators prioritize those needs, and this committee uses that list to develop in-service programs for the system.

On the first day of school, each staff member received a booklet that contains the philosophy, goals, and objectives of the district. This booklet also outlines the in-service opportunities to be afforded during that school year.

The positive characteristics that we have in our system I think would serve as a guideline for other systems in developing their program.

We have involvement of the entire school staff in identifying particular training needs. We have representation of the staff on a committee that is responsible for the planning, implementation, and the evaluation of the programs being offered.

The relevancy of each program to the stated philosophy and goals of the district and/or school are very clear and concisely stated.

Curricula are continuously reviewed and revised to better prepare our students for the future. Each program addresses the specific needs of the students in academic, social, and emotional issues, and I think all three of those areas need to be represented if we are going to produce responsible citizens in the future.

Commitment is readily apparent. Volunteers from the community and staff form committees to determine the focus, needs, and changes in the educational program.

Most of our administrators willingly help secure necessary funding to carry out in-service, allow staff to try out new ideas learned without fear of repercussion, and provide support to purchase needed materials.

Our system has a high percentage of teachers with advanced degrees and coursework, which reflects their commitment to high professional standards. Many of these teachers share their knowledge by serving on curriculum committees and conducting in-service programs.

Finally, we have recognition of professional development that is valued. Teachers feel rewarded for maintaining a high degree of professionalism through written recognition of their involvement, allotted professional days to pursue areas of interest or needs, and salary compensation for advanced coursework.

Though our staff development program has provided some high-quality programs that meet the diverse needs of our staff, we have not been able to accommodate the increasing demands on teachers.

Time is always a crucial element in planning and implementing staff development programs. Program evaluations consistently identify the need for more time to learn about and implement ideas successfully.

Currently, staff development activities are some of the professional activities that are added onto schooldays that are already

full. This limits participation of teachers in many activities that are crucial to the success of our schools.

Many teachers have obligations directly after school that prevent them from participating. Also, many teachers are exhausted at the end of the schoolday and thus are not able to benefit fully from in-service programs offered.

I believe that the solution to this concern will only become apparent when the entire community recognizes that the traditional school year provides very little time beyond what is needed to provide basic instruction.

Teachers have accepted that all students learn best when they are with their peers. This is a significant change from past practices of pulling children out of classrooms for remedial reading, mathematics, gifted, or handicapped programs.

We need programs that integrate these special populations. They are limited now, and when they do exist, they continue to isolate special needs rather than help teachers incorporate strategies within required curriculum activities to meet all students' needs.

Likewise, specialists that once worked in the isolation of the regular classroom are now expected to provide services within it but have extremely limited opportunities to acquire the curriculum knowledge necessary to help them integrate adaptive activities.

Information is increasing by leaps and bounds. Technologies that 10 years ago were innovative are now obsolete. Staff development opportunities have not prepared teachers fully in the uses of technological advances that are readily available.

While networking is a common tool for businesses to share information, local schools must wait for special funds to hook up to and use these information networks.

We also have problems providing enough technological resources for all students to be able to use them effectively.

The complexity of obtaining additional funds for staff development programs creates an unnecessary deterrent to applying for needed funding.

In our own district, our Assistant Superintendent provides instruction in the writing of grants. Grant applications ought to be clear enough for teachers and others to complete without additional training programs.

The language and format of grant applications should be consistent and meaningful not only to the professionals in the field but the entire community.

Any citizen reading the application should be able to understand clearly the purpose of every grant, how the money is disbursed, and the expected outcomes as a result of the grant initiative.

Senator PELL. Excuse me. Your full text will be put in the record as given. We have an airplane to catch.

Ms. LONG. Okay. Just a couple of other points that I would like to make.

We need to consolidate our funding sources so that we are applying to one body for funding that will provide materials, methods, staff development, and student needs.

I think that policymakers need to look at the school year as it is defined and perhaps restructure that school year with the inclu-

sion of community input, business input, teachers and parents, the whole environment, population.

We need to develop programs that are changing and meet the increasing demands, and we need to address our technological needs, and finally, we need to simplify grant applications so that they are understood by the total community.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Long follows:]

Submitted by Dorla Long
Matunuck Elementary School
South Kingstown, Rhode Island

INTRODUCTION:

Thank you for invit ng me to express my views on staff development. My comments will be based primarily on my personal experiences with the staff development program in the South Kingstown School District. I hope to provide you with some information on the range of opportunities provided to meet the needs of our teachers. I will describe how these activities are selected and planned. I will identify the characteristics common to our most successful programs, and the concerns I have regarding future staff development at the school district and individual school levels.

A wide variety of staff development opportunities are available to all the teachers of Rhode Island. Universities and colleges in Rhode Island offer regular and summer courses to learn about current curriculum methods and materials. Our State Department of Education has provided many opportunities for growth, particularly through its literacy initiative. Professional associations, including the Reading, Math and Assoc. for Supervision and Curriculum Development, provide conferences and workshops to keep Rhode Island's teachers abreast of effective instructional practices. Teachers in South Kingstown participate in these programs as well as the district's comprehensive program. Even with all of these opportunities, the demands on teachers exceed the present training being offered. Gifted, remedial, and handicapped students that were once pulled out of regular classrooms are now a part of mainstreamed classes. We need programs that will help teachers deal with special populations of students that were once segregated from our classes. In our multicultural society, we need programs that will help us reach students of all ethnic and cultural backgrounds. We need programs that incorporate technologies that will help our students function in a modern world.

DESCRIPTION OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT:

In South Kingstown, staff development is accomplished through many activities that are supported and encouraged by the administration and school committee. Inservice programs are offered after school and on release time days. Teachers are given professional days to attend conferences, visitations to other schools, and workshops. Many of our teachers perceive attending workshops and courses on a regular basis a necessity to better their own performances. Those with advanced degrees also receive compensation through an advanced salary scale. (The district requires 6 approved credit hours of further study every five years to maintain a teacher's advanced ratio salary.)

Our inservice program provides a range of opportunities that are based on the philosophy of our system to produce responsible citizens committed to lifelong learning. Course offerings include specifically designed programs to meet the needs of our parents and personnel including: aides, maintenance, teachers and administrators. To determine the program to be offered each year, information is gathered from staff needs surveys on specific topics which individuals feel need to be addressed. Next, a representative committee of teachers, support staff, and administrators prioritize the needs identified through the surveys. The committee uses this list as it develops the inservice program that will be offered in the following school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

On the first day of school each staff member receives a booklet that contains the philosophy, goals and objectives of the district. This booklet also provides a basic description of inservice programs that will be conducted during the year. Each staff member is free to choose the offering that meets his/her own professional development needs.

POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS:

The staff development programs that have been of high quality in our system contain some common factors. These factors include:

- Involvement of the entire school staff in identifying its particular training needs through the annual completion of needs surveys.
- Representation of the staff on a committee that is responsible for the planning, execution and evaluation of programs offered.
- Relevancy of each program to the stated philosophy and goals of the district and/or school. Curricula are continuously reviewed and revised to better prepare our students for the future. Each program addresses the specific needs of the students in academic, social, and/or emotional areas.
- Commitment is readily apparent. Volunteers from the community and staff form committees to determine the focus, needs, and changes in the educational program. Most of our administrators willingly: help secure necessary funding to carry out the inservice; allow staff to try out new ideas learned without fear of repercussion; and provide support to purchase needed materials. Our system has a high percentage of teachers with advanced degrees and course work which reflects their commitment to high professional standards. Many of these teachers share their knowledge by serving on curricula committees or conducting inservice programs.
- Recognition of professional development is valued. Teachers feel rewarded for maintaining a high degree of professionalism through written recognition of their involvement, allotted professional days to pursue areas of interest or needs, and salary compensation for advanced course work.

CONCERNS:

Though our staff development program has provided some high quality programs that meet the diverse needs of our staff, we have not been able to accommodate the increasing number of demands on teachers. I hope that some of these concerns will be addressed in future legislative decisions.

- Time is always a crucial element in planning and implementing staff development programs. Program evaluations consistently identify the need for more time to learn about and implement new ideas successfully. Currently, staff development activities are some of the professional activities that are added on to school days that are already full. This limits participation of teachers in many activities that are crucial to the success of our schools. Many teachers have obligations directly after school that prevent them from participating. Also, many teachers are exhausted at the end of the school day and thus are not able to benefit fully from inservice programs. I believe that the solution to this concern will only become apparent when the entire community recognizes that the traditional school year provides very little time beyond what is needed to provide basic instruction.

- Teachers have accepted that all students learn best when they are with their peers. This a significant change from past practices of pulling children out of classrooms for remedial reading, math, gifted, or handicapped, to teach them as unique and separate groups. However, the programs to integrate these once special populations of students are limited. And, when they do exist, they continue to isolate special needs rather than help teachers incorporate strategies within required curriculum activities to meet all students' needs. Likewise, the specialists that once worked in isolation of the regular classroom, but are now expected to provide services within it, have extremely limited opportunities to acquire the curriculum knowledge necessary to help them integrate adaptive activities.
- Information is increasing by leaps and bounds. Technologies that 10 years ago were innovative are now obsolete. Staff development opportunities have not prepared teachers fully in the uses of technological advances that are readily available. While networking is a common tool for businesses to share information, local schools must wait for special funds to hook up to and use information networks. We also have problems providing enough technological resources for all students to be able to use them effectively.
- The complexity of obtaining additional funds for staff development programs creates an unnecessary deterrent to applying for needed funding. In our own district our assistant superintendent provides instruction in the writing of grants. Grant applications ought to be clear enough for teachers and others to complete without additional training programs. The language and format of grant applications should be consistent and meaningful not only to professionals, but the entire community. Any citizen reading the application should be able to understand clearly the purpose of the grant, how money is disbursed through the grant, and the expected outcomes as a result of the grant initiative.
- Separate funding sources for an initiative in a curriculum, such as language arts or math, sometimes takes volumes of paper and time to secure the needed resources for programs that require equipment, consultants, materials, etc. Instead, it would be more practical for school districts to apply to one source for funds to meet all of its staff development needs.
- Since school districts must meet diverse community needs, specifications should be flexible enough to allow each district to channel funds to its own critical needs. Criteria could be applied to insure that funds are being used to meet state and national priorities as they reflect a district's approved philosophy and stated outcomes of instruction.

IMPLICATIONS:

Policy makers need to redefine the school year to reflect the time needed to carry out professional activities beyond the classroom instructional time. It is imperative that the entire community including: government agencies (Federal to local), businesses, parents, and educators become involved in determining a plan to redefine the school year to include the time necessary for the professional activities beyond the classroom that are essential to effective schools.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Programs need to be developed that meet the changing and increasing demands on classroom teachers. We need programs that are inclusive. Such programs would contain activities that meet the stated curricular goals and outcomes of the school district while providing for the special needs of all students. Curriculum outcomes need to be clearly understood by specialists so adaptive strategies can be implemented within regular classrooms.

Technology needs to be included in staff development programs if we are to have access to the most up to date information and prepare students for success beyond the school walls. New funding sources need to be identified to keep our educational institutions current in their uses of technology. While we may not be able to have the most sophisticated of equipment, we do need to provide students with experiences that expand their uses of technology beyond the limited scope of games, drills, tutorials and word processing.

Grant applications should be simplified so that they can be easily completed and understood by everyone. An application should be reviewed by one agency that provides the approval and funding for all components needed to carry out the program needed. Criteria to determine approval should be basic to provide for state and national goals, but flexible, to allow each community to meet the particular needs of its entire population.

It is an exciting time to be part of the educational community. We will be a part of innovative changes that redefine public education as we know it. Thank you for allowing me this opportunity to express my views on staff development.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much.

We now come to Ms. Andrew Mattia, whose hospitality we enjoy in the Flynn School, Head Teacher here.

Ms. Mattia.

Ms. MATTIA. Thank you, Senator Pell, Representative Reed, and Representative Unsoeld.

My name is Andrea Mattia. I am entering my 25th year of teaching, 24 of those years having been here at the Flynn School in Providence. Since March of 1991, I have also served as Head Teacher.

I work each morning with my fifth-grade students. My afternoons and evenings are devoted to my leadership responsibilities, addressing professional development needs, reading education research, writing grants, working with the Principal, parents, central school administrators, State Department of Education personnel, and chairing and serving on committees.

Flynn is an inner-city K-to-5 institution and a school of choice for students and teachers. Our 560 children come from all city neighborhoods. Our students' racial and ethnic profiles are diverse: 70 percent minority, 30 percent Caucasian. Their academic profiles span the ability continuum. Seventy five percent quality for free breakfast and lunch.

I speak to you today about two groups of individuals who historically have been left out of decisions regarding education, yet who are most affected by those very decisions. I speak of teachers and students.

Instruction and learning have been controlled by outsiders. Philosophies, pedagogies, methodologies seem to change names, courses, and demands each decade. Systems react. Teachers are given a workshop or none at all.

New volumes of curricula are distributed. Students change from one text to another, one coursework to another. Each is held accountable, the teachers to teach and the students to achieve.

The reality is, though both teacher and student struggle to fulfill their obligations, neither can. The deck is stacked against them; the process to effect quality change and achievement is flawed.

There is also a wild card in this deck which powerfully impacts instruction, learning, and achievement: the horrifying state of children's lives. I would like to introduce you to some of them.

Robert is now a fourth-grade student. He was born drug-addicted. His mom is dying of AIDS. He sleeps at greatgrandma's house until Grandma's 3-to-11 work shift is done. He is awakened to return home with grandma. Robert cannot remain focused on his schoolwork. His behavior is often disruptive.

Lisa, five, and Earl, six, are sister and brother. Mom is absent much of the time. They arrive at school each morning an hour before the doors open for breakfast. They probably have not eaten since school lunch the previous day.

Jeff is a first-grader. His kindergarten year was filled with vio-

lent outbursts which affected his achievement as well as his classmates'. His disturbing behavior continues. He has run from school on several occasions. It is only October 4.

James is a third-grader. He has Attention Deficit with Hyperactive Disorder. He is one of eight children. Mom is 30 years old. He is functionally illiterate and ashamed.

Gail is gifted, thoughtful, observant. She has a keen sense of her world. She lives with grandma because Mom is in residential detoxification. Gail is not achieving.

Because of the conditions of our students' lives, because these conditions impact the classroom, because teachers and students struggle together to address these obstacles while trying to teach and learn, we find our children and their schools in dire circumstances.

If expectations of teachers and their work is to change, then teacher education must change. Classroom teachers must be actively involved in the decisions to change the what and the how of what they teach and the assessment to evaluate those changes.

Staff development must derive from promising research that embraces what we know of cognitive theory and its application to the classroom. Staff development must be long-term.

Knowledgeable coaches to model and support instructional strategies must be provided over time. Staff development must engender continuous reflection and evaluation. Staff development must be flexible. Teachers' strengths, knowledge, and creativity must be recognized and nurtured.

The greater our knowledge, the more refined and focused our skills, the better our instructional practice, the greater our students' chances for academic success.

I will close with excerpts from a poem, "A Pledge of Responsibility for Children," by Ina Hughs. Her words are a compelling profile of urban public school children.

We accept responsibility for those
who stare at photographers from behind barbed wire,
who cannot bound down the street in new sneakers,
who never "counted potatoes,"
who are born in places we would not be caught dead,
who never go to the circus,
who live in an x-rated world,
who never get dessert,
who have no safe blanket to drag behind,
who watch their parents watch them die,
who cannot find bread to steal,
who do not have rooms to clean up,
whose pictures are not on anybody's dresser,
whose monsters are real,
whose nightmares come in the daytime,
who will eat anything,
who have never seen a dentist,
who are not spoiled by anybody,

who go to bed hungry and cry themselves to
sleep,
who live and move, but have no being.
Thank you.
[The prepared statement of Ms. Mattia follows:]

Testimony of Andrea Mattia

Senator Pell, Congressman Reed, Congresswoman Unsoeld, I am honored to be here today. I thank you for inviting me to testify.

My name is Andrea Mattia. I am beginning my twenty-fifth year of teaching, twenty-four of those years at Flynn. Since March, 1991, I have also served as Head Teacher. I work each morning with my fifth grade students. My afternoons and evenings are devoted to my leadership responsibilities: addressing professional development needs; reading education research; writing grants; working with the principal, parents, central school administrators, state department of education personnel; chairing and serving on committees.

Flynn is an inner-city, K-5 institution and a school of choice for teachers and students. Our 560 children come from all city neighborhoods. Our students' racial and ethnic profiles are diverse- 70% minority, 30% Caucasian. Their academic profiles span the ability continuum. Seventy-five percent qualify for free breakfast and lunch.

I speak to you today about two groups of individuals who, historically, have been left out of decisions regarding education, yet, who are most affected by those very decisions. I speak of teachers and students.

Instruction and learning have been controlled by outsiders. Philosophies, pedagogies, methodologies seem to change names, courses and demands each decade. Systems react. Teachers are given a workshop, or none at all. New volumes of curricula are distributed. Students change from one text to another, one coursework to another. Each is held accountable, the teachers to teach and the students to achieve. The reality is though both teacher and student struggle to fulfill their obligations, neither can. The deck is stacked against them; the process to affect quality change and achievement is flawed.

There is also a wild card in this deck which powerfully impacts instruction, learning and achievement - the horrifying state of children's lives. I would like to introduce you to some of them.

Robert is now a fourth grade student. He was born drug addicted. His mom is dying of AIDS. He sleeps at Great-Grandma's house until Grandma's three to eleven workshift is done. He is awakened to return home with Grandma. Robert cannot remain focused on his schoolwork. His behavior is often disruptive.

Lisa, five and Earl, six are sister and brother. Mom is absent much of the time. They arrive at school each morning an hour before the doors open for breakfast. They have not eaten since school lunch the previous day.

Jeff is a first grader. His kindergarten year was filled with violent outbursts which affected his achievement as well as his classmates'. His disturbing behavior continues. He has run from school on several occasions. It is only October 4.

James is a third grader. He is ADHD/ Attention Deficit with Hyperactive Disordered. He is one of eight children. Mom is thirty years old. He is functionally illiterate and ashamed.

Gail is a gifted child, thoughtful and observant. She has a keen sense of her world. She lives with Grandma because Mom is in residential detox. Gail is not achieving.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Because of the conditions of our students' lives, because these conditions impact the classroom, because teachers and students struggle together to address these obstacles while trying to teach and learn, we find our children and their schools in dire circumstances.

If expectations of teachers and their work is to change, then teacher education must change. Classroom teachers must be actively involved in the decisions to change the what and how of what they teach and the assessment to evaluate those changes. Staff development must derive from promising research that embraces what we know of cognitive theory and its application to the classroom. Staff development must be long-term. Knowledgeable coaches to model and support instructional strategies must be provided over time. Staff development must engender continuous reflection and evaluation. Staff development must be flexible. Teachers' strengths, knowledge and creativity must be recognized and nurtured. The greater our knowledge, the more refined and focused our skills, the better our instructional practice, the greater our students' chances for academic success.

I will close with excerpts from a poem, *A Pledge of Responsibility for Children* by Ina Hughs. Her words are a compelling profile of urban public school children.

We accept responsibility for those
who stare at photographers from behind barbed wire,
who can't bound down the street in new sneakers,
who never "counted potatoes",
who are born in places we wouldn't be caught dead,
who never go to the circus,
who live in an X-rated world.
We accept responsibility for those
who never get dessert,
who have no safe blanket to drag behind,
who watch their parents watch them die,
who can't find bread to steal,
who don't have rooms to clean up,
whose pictures aren't on anybody's dresser,
whose monsters are real.
We accept responsibility for those
whose nightmares come in the daytime,
who will eat anything,
who have never seen a dentist,
who aren't spoiled by anybody,
who go to bed hungry and cry themselves to sleep,
who live and move, but have no being.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, indeed, for very moving testimony, beautifully written and read.

Ms. MATTIA. Thank you.

Senator PELL. I just have one question, and that is, as you know, the number of minority youngsters is increasing, and the percentage of the number of minority teachers is declining. Do any of you have any ideas of how we could reverse that?

Ms. CHERRY. I have an idea, Senator Pell. I think that, if we are going to recruit minority teachers, we are going to have to recruit where they are, and I specifically can speak about black Americans.

If we are going to recruit teachers, we have to go to historically black schools, I believe, and we also have to make sure that teachers are well compensated so that we can recruit the best and the brightest.

I know for a fact that a lot of young people today that I work with would have no idea of going into teaching, and I have a young woman who happens to be my daughter who just started a teaching job in Worcester, Massachusetts, and she is teaching social studies to Spanish-speaking children, but there was a time when she would have nothing to do with teaching.

I think somehow she felt that it was in her blood, and she was a product of a historically black school, Tuskegee University, which is also my alma mater.

I think we have to go where those teachers are to recruit.

Senator PELL. Thank you very much, and I think, probably, at this point, I would like to turn the hearing over to Congressman Reed, acknowledge the presence of all of you who are here—thank you for being here—particularly say to Brother Casey that I am well aware of the contribution made by the private schools and thank them and thank Mrs. Unsoeld for coming from the State of Washington, via Washington, DC and also thank Tom Wolanin for being with us from the Department of Education.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Senator, and if I may seize the moment and ask a few questions, there have been a few themes that have been expressed today in the testimony of all the witnesses, none of which, I might add, are as compelling or as moving as the testimony I have heard from each of you because of your proximity to the issue of professional development, but one thing was collegiality and another thing that emerged was evaluation, truly looking at the system of education and evaluating how well people do.

So, I wondered if you might respond to those notions from your experience as classroom teachers or as an administrator of the system on whether there is sufficient collegiality and what we can do to more fairly evaluate teachers so that they would be inspired to engage in significant professional development.

So, Brother, would you start, or anyone who has a thought?

Mr. CASEY. Well, what I have noticed, maybe 10 of our 65 schools have adopted peer supervision, and you know, it is remarkable, teachers never see each other teach.

So, it started very informally, and now it is formalized where it is a collaborative model, and the weight of responsibility is not on the administrative core.

In at least Catholic schools, sometimes the principals have been so long away from, as we say, work in the trenches that the teachers feel they do not understand clearly what is required day by day in class, and we have had great success with the peer supervision model, and it seems to me the route to take in our situation.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Colleen?

Ms. BIELECKI. Congressman, I would echo that, and one thing that I would tell you is that, as a practitioner, it is very difficult to practice in front of a group of children.

When we talk about retooling any other industry, lots of times we think about shutting that industry down while we retool.

When you have 27 fifth-graders or sixth-graders or any group of students in front of you, you do not shut down, and I think that one of the things that I would like to see be able to happen is that we could eliminate some of the fear that practitioners have.

We all bring a lot of healthy skepticism to reform efforts. I have been teaching for 20 years, and I have seen a lot of things.

I tell the story very often that I started teaching in an open-space elementary school, that about five years later we were told no, it is the back-to-basics, and so the walls went up and the tables came out and the desks were put back in rows, and about five or six years later, the walls are still there, but the desks are out and the tables are back in, and we are asking students and teachers to begin to work collaboratively.

That frightens people who have been trained in a particular way and are asked to retool and redesign their methods of instruction, very often, as Mr. McWalters said, alone, without the benefit, as Brother Casey said, of watching other people do it.

So, I would advocate, first of all, for the time to try things and not—and to support teachers as they go about trying that. Very often, that does happen if we could allow time for collegiality to take place.

That may mean that we have to take a look at our schedules. That may mean that we have to provide opportunities for teachers to visit other teachers' classrooms even in their own school.

Lots of times, when we think about self-development, we think about going someplace far away to see some expert somewhere practice the craft when, to tell you the truth, there are a lot of wonderful things happening in our own schools.

The last thing that I would say about that is that evaluations of programs like that, where teachers have been provided the time to experiment and to collaborate, where they have been allowed to meet and design the programs that they know would best work in their school, with their staff, and for the children that they serve, when we take a look at those evaluations, those are the evaluations that tell us we are on the right track.

When teachers are asked to go to what I must tell you is very often considered to be meaningless staff development, something that has been designed by someone far away that does not touch what it is they are trying to do in class and has no meaning and no followup, those evaluations tell us a different story.

So, I think that evaluation of staff development is necessary, and I think that evaluation of our own work should be less judgmental,

and it should be more in a helping vein, so that instead of being penalized for trying something new, you are encouraged to go further with that.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Shirley?

Ms. CHERRY. I think I would like to see more mentoring programs where the more veteran teacher is paired with a younger teacher, because a lot of—as I said before, I think we do a fairly good job of teaching teachers in the content area, but there are some other items that go along with good teachers, things such as you must care about students, you must have high expectations, you must have high standards, and I think that, if we had more interaction, a more formalized, perhaps, mentoring program, that that might be a good way to go, and the other idea, as far as evaluation goes, I would like to concur with what my—what Colleen has just said, is that we need to evaluate more on the basis of what can administrators and other teachers do to help teachers improve their teaching skills.

I know I constantly remind my principal that you are not called principal for nothing, you are the principal teacher, and I think that is very important.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Shirley.

Dorla?

Ms. LONG. I think the two points that I see in teacher evaluation that are important are collaboration and the time to do it.

I really, really think that we have to look at the schoolday and the school year to provide the professional opportunities to collaborate with one another. I do not think that we can do these activities in a short school year of 180 days.

I think that businesses, oftentimes, provide their employees with opportunities that we just do not get in the public education sector, and you cannot do it without time.

Mr. REED. Andrea?

Ms. MATTIA. I think that teachers are very good at being congenial. We have never been encouraged to be collegial. I think being collegial takes a lot of time. It possibly takes its own form of staff development.

It is very difficult to work alongside colleagues and, after a good morning or a good afternoon, to then sit down and become the critic.

I think you have to develop an environment in the school that is trusting before you can even expect collegiality to occur.

I think teachers have to feel that they can take risks in the classroom and, as someone has said, that they can fail and then succeed before those kinds of expectations can be had.

Evaluation—I think everybody involved in working with children has something to do with that process.

I think that everybody is accountable, in one way, shape, or form, to some sort of evaluation, be it the parent, the student, the teacher, the school administrator, central administrator, or the school board person, and I think, in some way, we have to develop evaluation mechanisms that speak to all the various accountable people with regard to children in this country.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Now I would like to call on my colleague, Mrs. Unsoeld.

Mrs. UNSOELD. I would just like to thank Senator Pell and you, Jack, for letting me share with you this very inspiring set of panelists, and to all of you, the other panelists also, I would like to say thank you not only for your ideas, your inspiration, but probably most of all for the increased resolve you have given us to go back and shift priorities so that we can help provide the financing that is so necessary. You deserve it.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

I would like to add my commendation to Senator Pell's and Mrs. Unsoeld's not only for what you have said today but what you do every day to reach out and deal with very difficult issues. Andrea's poignant stories of young people are all too numerous and all too real in every school system, both public and private, and the reason we are doing anything at all is because of teachers like yourselves.

So, I thank you for that, and we pledge our best efforts to give you the resources, particularly in staff development, that will allow you to do the job better, that will touch the lives of children more forcefully and purposefully and will make this country live up to its very best ideals.

I would like to, on one administrative point, note that the hearing record will remain open for two weeks in order that we might receive and include any additional statements that are submitted, and thank you all so very, very much, and this concludes the hearing. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

[Additonal material submitted for the record follows.]

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee

Thank you for the opportunity to share my experience in and my insights about Chapter 1 and its reauthorization.

I am Carley Ochoa and I direct Compensatory Education programs in the Riverside Unified School District located in Southern California. I have worked with Title I - Chapter 1 since the late 1960's.

I would like to begin by telling you about the features of our current Hawkins Stafford bill that I like - the things that are working - and to urge you to not make changes for the sake of change - to not submit to the rhetoric of those who would tell you that Chapter 1 is a dismal failure.

IT IS NOT!

I will also respond to the U.S. Department of Education's proposed language for the reauthorization of ESEA which was presented to your House Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education on June 23, 1993.

I speak to you as a practitioner at the local level who looks at the current legislation as a real breakthrough from the old notion we had about Chapter 1 being a remedial, basic skills program. In April of 1988, the President signed PL100-297 that reflected a major shift in the way we had been operating Chapter 1 programs.

We now had a purpose which said students should be successful in the regular program, and that we improve basic as well as more advanced skills, that provided us the opportunity to set aside up to 5% of the funds for innovation, that allowed us top implement Schoolwide programs without matching funds, and in return for these many new flexibilities said that we had to be accountable for the achievement outcomes of students.

Somehow this all sounds a little familiar - I have read several commission reports and articles that suggest we should be re writing and re-inventing Chapter 1 to allow us to do these very things - - - - that we already can.

The Commission on Chapter 1 decided the challenge was to convert Chapter 1 from a "law designed to teach poor children basic skills to one dedicated to spurring the kinds of educational change that would result in children born into poverty acquiring high-level knowledge and skills." Again - this language sounds very familiar - - it is now stated pretty clearly in the purpose of the current law for Chapter 1. People have said that we need to make more than cosmetic changes to Chapter 1. Where we need to make more than cosmetic changes is in our basic educational program - some people refer to "systemic reform" as the panacea for all that ails us in public education. Agreed, we need to reform our public education system - I am here to plead with you that we not try to do it at the expense of our Chapter 1 children.

So, I say perhaps we do need only to "tinker with the current bill around the edges" - - we do want to look at the formula and how often we need to realign it with census and other data - - we do want to look at better coordination with other funding sources for increased benefit to our identified Chapter 1 youngsters - - we do want to encourage the expansion of preschools and integrated social and educational services - - we do want to look at assessment and make reasonable changes which allow us to make intelligent program modifications, and, at the same time, have nationwide data that can be aggregated for those all-important evaluation purposes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I do not agree with the concept of technical assistance replacing the concept of compliance. We need to continue to focus on meeting the needs of identified children - - - in a compliant manner that will insure that their programs will not be diluted - - - and with increased support from the federal level.

This brings me to the Administration's proposal for Title I ESEA. (1) the funding shift which would virtually move 40% of the total basic grant from all districts to large urban school districts. Being from a "suburban-edge city" of Los Angeles and knowing that we serve children in Chapter 1 schools that have 95% of their children on free lunch, I naturally get a little concerned over that move. While I know cities need all the help in the world, please don't further impoverish our already poor children because they live in a county that is next door to Los Angeles and not part of it. Our Chapter 1 schools serve children - with excellent preschool through 8th grade programs where they are making good progress - who are, in the main, immigrants, limited English speaking, poor, and residing in areas riddled also with drug dealers and gang warfare.

The federal top-down approach of the Administration's proposal gives me some concerns. For example, in the school ranking provision, districts would now have to rank K-12 first instead of the current group ranking allowance. This virtually forces unified districts to place their money at high schools when we already have an established philosophy and policy to place our resources at the earliest possible level, including pre and pre-preschool to help not only the children but the families as well with social services and literacy. This provision would take away another piece of local decision making ability about our needs, our children, and our schools.

I support their notion of more decisions being made at the school site rather than by "administration" - it has always been that way in my district, not because the law says so, but because that's the way you get programs to serve kids well with all staff at that school site coming to consensus about how to do the best job for their children.

I am opposed to the notion that all schools that have 50% poverty should be Schoolwide. This is a way to use Chapter 1 money as general aid in schools that ought to have district supported reform efforts. We, in our district, have Chapter 1 schools from 95% poverty down to 55%. There is no comparison between the needs of those schools. In my district, a school with 50% poverty looks "average."

I have some concerns about the assessments as described in the Department's proposal, not that I don't agree that we certainly need improvements. It does, however, mean that we will be floundering around for a considerable amount of time deciding which assessments are indeed valid, reliable, and able to be aggregated for national purposes.

Their proposed legislation mandates School Support Teams composed of a few experts in research, curriculum, etc. which would have to work with schools planning to come into Schoolwide. Logistically, of course, it is unlikely to be possible, and it also implies that a district that already has successful, effective Schoolwide programs don't know how to get another one going without external "experts" coming in to help you plan for a year. The very notion defeats the purpose intended - that of having more effective Schoolwide programs.

Last, I would like to address the notion of "systemic reform" that the Administration would have Chapter 1 "bludgeon" districts and schools with. Reform needs to happen! States and the federal government need to help us accomplish reforms in public education. My plea, again, is that we please not do it at the expense of Chapter 1 children.

My greatest hope is that Congress will strengthen those measures in the current law designed to deliver dynamic learning experiences with good results to our Chapter 1 children - - - give it a chance to work - - - and keep faith with the promise made to children in the War on Poverty and Civil Rights legislation.

Thank you.

81-246 (88)

ISBN 0-16-044776-3